```
ADAM A. REEVES (NYBN 2363877)
    Attorney for the United States,
    Acting Under Authority Conferred By 28 U.S.C. § 515
    HALLIE HOFFMAN (CABN 210020)
 3
    Chief, Criminal Division
 4
    JEFF SCHENK (CABN 234355)
 5
    JOHN C. BOSTIC (CABN 264367)
    ROBERT S. LEACH (CABN 196191)
    VANESSA BAEHR-JONES (CABN 281715)
 6
    Assistant United States Attorneys
 7
          150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900
 8
          San Jose, California 95113
          Telephone: (408) 535-5061
 9
          Fax: (408) 535-5066
          Robert.Leach@usdoj.gov
10
    Attorneys for United States of America
11
                                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12
                              NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13
                                       SAN JOSE DIVISION
14
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
                                                Case No. 18-CR-00258 EJD
15
16
          Plaintiff,
                                                SEPTEMBER 18, 2020 DECLARATION OF
                                                AUSA ROBERT S. LEACH IN SUPPORT OF
                                                UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO
17
                                                DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
    ELIZABETH HOLMES and RAMESH
18
                                                SECOND AND THIRD SUPERSEDING
    "SUNNY" BALWANI,
                                                INDICTMENTS BASED ON PRE-
                                                INDICTMENT DELAY
19
          Defendants.
                                                Date: October 6, 2020
20
                                                Time: 10:00 a.m.
                                                Court: Hon. Edward J. Davila
21
22
                                                REDACTED VERSION
23
24
          I, Robert S. Leach, declare as follows:
25
          1.
                 I am an Assistant United States Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office for the
    Northern District of California ("USAO"). I am one of the prosecutors assigned to this matter and have
26
27
    been since 2016. I make this declaration in support of the United States' Opposition to Defendants'
28
    Motion to Dismiss Second and Third Superseding Indictments Based on Pre-Indictment Delay.
    LEACH DECL. RE SPEEDY TRIAL MOT.
    CASE NO. 18-258 EJD
                                              1
```

1	2. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the transcript of a hearing in this		
2	matter on April 22, 2019.		
3	3. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of portions of the transcript of a hearing		
4	in this matter on June 28, 2019.		
5	4. Attached as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of		
6	·		
7	5. Attached as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of		
8			
9			
10	6. Attached as Exhibit E is a true and correct copy of the transcript of a hearing in this		
11	matter on April 15, 2020.		
12	7. Attached as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of portions of the transcript of a hearing		
13	in this matter on July 20, 2020.		
14	8. Attached as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of a document Bates numbered SEC-		
15	EPROD-000356416 produced in discovery in this case. The document appears to be an email from Dor		
16	Lucas' son on or about September 22, 2013 stating: "my dad was Chairman of [Theranos] until his		
17	Alzheimer's." Personal identifying information is redacted.		
18	9. The government produced evidence it had gathered from Walgreens, Safeway, and		
19	Theranos board members in its initial productions in August 2018 and October 2018. To give just a fev		
20	examples, witness statements from at least two Walgreens witnesses (Jay Rosan and Nimesh Javeri);		
21	Safeway's CEO, and three Theranos board members and documents Bates numbered WAG-TH-DOJ		
22	and SWYDOJ were included in the government's initial productions.		
23	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 18th day		
24	of September 2020.		
25	/s Robert S. Leach ROBERT S. LEACH		
26	Assistant United States Attorney		
27			
28			
	iī		

## EXHIBIT A

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR-18-00258-EJD & ) CV-18-01603-EJD
6	PLAINTIFF, ) )
7	VS. ) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA )
8	ELIZABETH A. HOLMES AND RAMESH ) APRIL 22, 2019 SUNNY BALWANI, )
9	) PAGES 1 - 27 DEFENDANTS. )
10	
11	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ) COMMISSION, )
12	PLAINTIFF, )
13	VS.
14	RAMESH SUNNY BALWANI, )
15	DEFENDANTS. )
16	
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:
19	
20	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  BY: JOHN BOSTIC
21	ROBERT LEACH  JEFFREY SCHENK  150 ALMADEN BOLLEVARD CHIEF 000
22	150 ALMADEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 900 SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:
24	IRENE L. RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER

1		
2	<u>APPEARANCES:</u>	(CONT'D)
3	FOR DEFENDANT HOLMES:	WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP BY: KEVIN M. DOWNEY
4		LANCE WADE
5		725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
6		LAW OFFICE OF JOHN D. CLINE BY: JOHN D. CLINE
7		ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 500 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
8		·
9	FOR DEFENDANT BALWANT:	DAVIS, WRIGHT & TREMAINE LLP BY: JEFFREY COOPERSMITH STEPHEN CAZARES
10		KELLY M. GORTON
11		505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
12	FOR THE S.E.C.:	UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
13		BY: SUSAN F. LAMARCA RAHUL KOLHATKAR
14		44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104
15		SAN FIMICISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	APRIL 22, 2019
	2	PROC	E E D I N G S
	3	(COURT CONVENED AT 1:36	P.M.)
01:36PM	4	THE COURT: WELL,	LET'S NOW TURN TO 18-258, UNITED
01:36PM	5	STATES VERSUS ELIZABETH HOLM	ES, RAMESH SUNNY BALWANI, AND WE'LL
01:36PM	6	CALL COMPANION CASE 18-1603,	S.E.C. VERSUS BALWANI.
01:36PM	7	IF THOSE PARTIES COULD (	COME FORWARD, PLEASE.
01:36PM	8	MR. BOSTIC: GOOD	AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.
01:36PM	9	JOHN BOSTIC, JEFF SCHENK, AN	D BOB LEACH FOR THE UNITED STATES.
01:36PM	10	THE COURT: GOOD A	FTERNOON. LET ME CAPTURE YOUR
01:37PM	11	COLLEAGUES.	
01:37PM	12	MS. LAMARCA: SUSA	N LAMARCA AND RAHUL KOLHATKAR FOR
01:37PM	13	THE S.E.C.	
01:37PM	14	THE COURT: THANK	YOU.
01:37PM	15	MR. DOWNEY: GOOD	AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.
01:37PM	16	KEVIN DOWNEY AND LANCE WADE	FOR ELIZABETH HOLMES WHO'S PRESENT
01:37PM	17	IN COURT AS WELL.	
01:37PM	18	THE COURT: THANK	YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON.
01:37PM	19	MR. COOPERSMITH:	GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.
01:37PM	20	JEFF COOPERSMITH FOR RAMESH I	BALWANI WHO IS TO MY RIGHT AND ALSO
01:37PM	21	KELLY GORTON AND STEVE CAZAR	ES FROM MY OFFICE.
01:37PM	22	THE COURT: GOOD A	FTERNOON. THIS IS ON FOR FURTHER
01:37PM	23	STATUS. I HAVE READ AND REV	IEWED YOUR DOCUMENT 66, AND WE'RE
01:37PM	24	CALLING THE CRIMINAL CASE FI	RST, AND THEN WE'LL TURN TO THE
01:37PM	25	S.E.C. CASE IN JUST A MOMENT	•

1 01:37PM 2 01:37PM 3 01:37PM 01:37PM 4 01:37PM 01:37PM 6 01:37PM 7 01:38PM 8 01:38PM 9 01:38PM 10 01:38PM 11 01:38PM 12 01:38PM 13 01:38PM 14 01:38PM 15 01:38PM 16 01:38PM 17 01:38PM 18 01:38PM 19 01:38PM 20 01:38PM 21 01:38PM 22 01:38PM 23 01:38PM 24 01:38PM 25

I HAVE READ THE JOINT MEMORANDUM. THANK YOU FOR THAT.

I SUPPOSE I SHOULD GET UPDATED FROM COUNSEL. IT LOOKS
LIKE THERE'S PROBABLY TWO MOTIONS THAT WILL BE PENDING IF NOT
PENDING CURRENTLY, AND I'D LIKE TO DISCUSS THAT. I HAD SOME
THOUGHTS ALSO ABOUT TRIAL DATES, AND WE SHOULD PROBABLY BE
THINKING ABOUT AND LOOKING AT TRIAL DATES ONGOING.

SO, COUNSEL, WHO WOULD LIKE TO GO FIRST? MR. BOSTIC.

MR. BOSTIC: SO, YOUR HONOR, ON THE TWO PENDING MOTIONS MY COLLEAGUE, MR. LEACH, WILL ADDRESS THE MOTION TO STAY WHEN WE DISCUSS THAT.

ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY PRODUCTION FROM
THE GOVERNMENT, AS THE COURT KNOWS FROM THE JOINT STATUS
SUBMISSION, THE GOVERNMENT HAS PRODUCED APPROXIMATELY 20
MILLION PAGES ALREADY. THE ADDITIONAL CATEGORIES OF DOCUMENTS
ADDRESSED IN THE PENDING MOTION ARE MOSTLY HELD IN THE HANDS OF
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES LIKE THE FDA AND THE CMS.

IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO THAT MOTION, THE GOVERNMENT
BELIEVES THAT IT NEEDS TO COLLECT SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
FROM THOSE AGENCIES.

I INFORMED COUNSEL FOR MS. HOLMES JUST BEFORE THIS HEARING
THAT THE LAWYERS THAT I'VE BEEN DEALING WITH AT CMS AND FDA ARE
OUT OF TOWN OR RECENTLY OUT OF TOWN AND I BELIEVE OUT OF THE
COUNTRY.

ONE REPRESENTING CMS RETURNS FROM BEING ON LEAVE I BELIEVE
ON MAY 1ST OR 2ND. I THINK IN ORDER TO PRESENT THE COURT WITH

01:39PM	1	THE FACTS THAT IT NEEDS TO RULE ON THAT MOTION, I DO NEED TO
01:39PM	2	CONSULT WITH THOSE ATTORNEYS. THE GOVERNMENT COUNSEL IN THIS
01:39PM	3	CASE DOES NOT REPRESENT THOSE AGENCIES AND WILL NOT REPRESENT
01:39PM	4	THOSE AGENCIES FOR PURPOSES OF THIS CASE. SO IN ORDER TO GET
01:39PM	5	THAT INFORMATION FOR THE COURT, I WOULD LIKE A CHANCE TO
01:39PM	6	CONSULT WITH THOSE LAWYERS. SO I WOULD JUST ASK THAT IN
01:39PM	7	SETTING A BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE FOR THAT MOTION WE
01:39PM	8	ACCOUNT FOR THAT.
01:39PM	9	THE COURT: OKAY. HAVE YOU MET AND CONFERRED ABOUT
01:39PM	10	THAT?
01:39PM	11	MR. DOWNEY: YOUR HONOR, WE DISCUSSED IT. OUR
01:39PM	12	REFLECTION ON MR. BOSTIC'S REQUEST WAS OF COURSE WE WANT TO
01:39PM	13	ACCOMMODATE HIM UNDERTAKING A REASONABLE PROCESS SO THE MOTION
01:39PM	14	CAN BE BRIEFED.
01:39PM	15	WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT THE PACE OF THE PRODUCTION OF
01:39PM	16	DISCOVERY. THERE'S NO
01:39PM	17	THE COURT: IT'S ONLY MILLIONS OF PAGES.
01:39PM	18	MR. DOWNEY: YEAH, MILLIONS OF PAGES HAVE ALREADY
01:39PM	19	BEEN PRODUCED. I GATHER MILLIONS MORE ARE TO BE PRODUCED.
01:39PM	20	SO WE DON'T OPPOSE THAT. WE JUST IN THE CONTEXT OF A
01:39PM	21	BROADER DISCUSSION ABOUT WHEN IT'S REALISTIC TO SET A TRIAL
01:39PM	22	DATE.
01:39PM	23	THE COURT: SURE.
01:39PM	24	MR. DOWNEY: SO ASSUMING THAT WE HAVE, YOU KNOW, AN
01:40PM	25	OPPORTUNITY, IF WE PREVAIL ON THE MOTION, AN ADEQUATE

1 01:40PM 2 01:40PM 3 01:40PM 01:40PM 4 01:40PM 01:40PM 01:40PM 7 8 01:40PM 01:40PM 9 01:40PM 10 01:40PM 11 01:40PM 12 01:40PM 13 01:40PM 14 01:40PM 15 01:40PM 16 01:40PM 17 01:41PM 18 01:41PM 19 01:41PM 20 01:41PM 21 01:41PM 22 01:41PM 23 01:41PM 24 01:41PM 25

OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW WHATEVER IS PRODUCED, THAT'S FINE WITH US. WE'RE JUST CONCERNED BECAUSE THE AMOUNT OF TIME, LEAD TIME THAT THE GOVERNMENT PROPOSED IN THE JOINT STATUS MEMORANDUM SOUNDS LIKE A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME, BUT GIVEN THE VOLUME OF MATERIAL IT'S REALLY NOT.

SO OUR CONCERN ABOUT THAT IS NOT ACCOMMODATING MR. BOSTIC, WHICH WE'RE HAPPY TO DO, IT'S JUST ABOUT THE BROADER SET OF ISSUES.

THE COURT: SURE. WELL, THANK YOU.

MY SENSE, AND IT'S PROBABLY YOUR EXPERIENCE ALSO, WITH
THESE TYPES OF MOTIONS TYPICALLY THERE'S ADDITIONAL MEET AND
CONFERS. SOMETIMES THERE'S RESOLUTION REGARDING WHAT CAN BE
OBTAINED AND WHAT IS OBTAINED. SOMETIMES THE INFORMATION, WHEN
THE GOVERNMENT IS IN THEIR SITUATION THAT THEY'RE IN NOW, WHEN
THEY MEET WITH THE OTHER INDIVIDUALS THEY'RE ABLE TO SECURE
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT MIGHT NOT CURE THE ENTIRETY OF THE
DEFECTS AS YOU SEE IT NOW BUT AT LEAST GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS
THAT.

MR. BOSTIC AND MR. SCHENK, IF WHAT I'M HEARING IS THAT YOU NEED TO DISCUSS OR AT LEAST TALK WITH OTHER AGENCIES REGARDING OTHER DISCOVERY MATTERS THAT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO THAT CONVERSATION, THAT'S WHAT I'M HEARING, THEN I THINK THAT MAYBE WE CAN FIND SOME ACCORD WHERE I DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED AN ADDITIONAL STATUS TO DETERMINE A DATE OR IF I GIVE YOU DATES NOW. I HATE TO DO THAT NOW AND BLIND THEM NOT KNOWING WHAT IS

01:41PM	1	IN STORE FOR YOUR CONVERSATIONS.
01:41PM	2	MR. BOSTIC: YOUR HONOR, JUST TO BE CLEAR, I THINK
01:41PM	3	THAT IS PART OF THE OBJECTIVE OF THOSE ADDITIONAL CONVERSATIONS
01:41PM	4	WITH AGENCY COUNSEL TO SEE WHETHER THERE'S SOME MIDDLE GROUND,
01:41PM	5	SOME ABILITY TO COMPROMISE.
01:41PM	6	BUT IN ADDITION, I BELIEVE THAT THE DEFENSE MOTION WILL
01:41PM	7	TURN AT LEAST PARTLY OR IN LARGE PART ON WHETHER THE
01:41PM	8	GOVERNMENT, WHETHER THE PROSECUTION IS DEEMED TO HAVE ACCESS TO
01:41PM	9	THE DOCUMENTS IN THE POSSESSION OF THESE AGENCIES.
01:41PM	10	SO IT'S REALLY TO EXPLAIN THOSE RELEVANT FACTS TO THE
01:42PM	11	COURT TO DETERMINE TO WHAT EXTENT DO WE HAVE ACCESS TO THOSE
01:42PM	12	DOCUMENTS.
01:42PM	13	THE COURT: SURE. YOU CAN'T HAVE THAT CONVERSATION
01:42PM	14	UNTIL THE FIRST PART OF MAY IT SOUNDS LIKE.
01:42PM	15	MR. BOSTIC: CORRECT, YOUR HONOR, AT LEAST WE
01:42PM	16	CANNOT AT LEAST AS TO CMS WE CANNOT FINISH THAT CONVERSATION
01:42PM	17	UNTIL THEN.
01:42PM	18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE SUGGESTIONS
01:42PM	19	ABOUT WHAT WE SHOULD DO?
01:42PM	20	MR. DOWNEY: YOUR HONOR, I THINK MY SUGGESTION WOULD
01:42PM	21	BE THAT WE FILE AN UPDATE WITH THE COURT PERHAPS AT THE END OF
01:42PM	22	THE WEEK FOLLOWING THE WEEK WHEN MR. BOSTIC ANTICIPATES THAT
01:42PM	23	HE'LL HAVE THOSE CONVERSATIONS.
01:42PM	24	MY CONCERN IS ONLY THIS, I ANTICIPATE THAT THE AGENCIES
01:42PM	25	PROBABLY WILL PRODUCE SOME ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF MATERIAL. IT'S

01:42PM	1	CLEAR TO US FROM OUR REVIEW OF WHAT HAS BEEN PRODUCED THUS FAR
01:42PM	2	THAT THERE'S A GOOD BIT OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL THAT IS PROBABLY
01:42PM	3	MATERIAL TO OUR PREPARATION AND IN MANY INSTANCES EXCULPATORY.
01:42PM	4	IT MAY BE PREFERABLE ULTIMATELY FOR THE AGENCIES TO
01:42PM	5	CONDUCT THEIR THOUGHT PROCESS ON THEIR REVIEW RECOGNIZING THAT
01:42PM	6	THEY'RE GOING TO BE OBLIGATED TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS WHICH MEET
01:43PM	7	THOSE STANDARDS.
01:43PM	8	SO I DON'T WANT TO FORESHADOW WHAT THEIR CONSULTATION
01:43PM	9	PROCESS YIELDS, BUT I THINK WE SHOULD REPORT BACK AT THE END OF
01:43PM	10	THE WEEK AFTER THE WEEK THAT MR. BOSTIC CONSULTS WITH HIS
01:43PM	11	COLLEAGUES AND OTHER AGENCIES, BUT WE MAY AT THAT TIME FIND
01:43PM	12	WE'RE NOT MAKING SUFFICIENT PROGRESS, THAT WE WOULD LIKE THE
01:43PM	13	MOTION TO BE HEARD.
01:43PM	14	BUT I DON'T WANT TO FOREJUDGE THAT, YOUR HONOR. WE CAN
01:43PM	15	SEE.
01:43PM	16	THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU. THE ISSUE BEFORE THE
01:43PM	17	COURT NOW IS TO DETERMINE A BRIEFING SCHEDULE
01:43PM	18	MR. DOWNEY: YES.
01:43PM	19	THE COURT: AS TO WHEN THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD FILE
01:43PM	20	THEIR REPLY AND OPPOSITION.
01:43PM	21	MR. DOWNEY: UNDERSTOOD. AND I THINK WE CAN DEFER
01:43PM	22	THE OPPOSITION AT LEAST UNTIL WE FILE THAT MEMORANDUM AND UNTIL
01:43PM	23	WE FILE THAT JOINT UPDATE.
01:43PM	24	THE COURT: SURE.
01:43PM	25	MR. DOWNEY: AND IF, IN FACT, AT THAT TIME IT'S

NECESSARY FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO CONTINUE AND GO AHEAD AND BRIEF 1 01:43PM 2 IT, WE'LL DO IT THEN. 01:43PM MR. BOSTIC: YOUR HONOR, NO OBJECTION TO THAT 3 01:43PM 01:43PM 4 APPROACH FROM THE GOVERNMENT. THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME ASK, IS THERE ANY 01:43PM 01:43PM 6 CONNECTION BETWEEN -- LET'S TURN TO THE S.E.C. CASE FOR JUST A 01:44PM 7 MOMENT. I UNDERSTAND THE GOVERNMENT HAS FILED A MOTION TO 01:44PM 8 INTERVENE IN THE CRIMINAL CASE. I'M JUST CURIOUS WHETHER 01:44PM 9 01:44PM 10 THERE'S SOME CROSS-POLLINIZATION BETWEEN THESE TWO THINGS. 01:44PM 11 MR. LEACH: YES, YOUR HONOR. MR. LEACH FOR THE GOVERNMENT. I DON'T THINK THERE IS. THE DISCOVERY THAT 01:44PM 12 MS. HOLMES IS SEEKING ARE DOCUMENTS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE 01:44PM 13 01:44PM 14 FDA AND CMS WHICH THE GOVERNMENT CONTENDS ARE NOT PART OF THE 01:44PM 15 PROSECUTION TEAM AND NOT SUBJECT TO OUR RULE 16 BRADY AND 01:44PM 16 GIGLIO OBLIGATIONS. 01:44PM 17 THE MOTION TO INTERVENE AND STAY IS REALLY DIRECTED AT 01:44PM 18 SOME DISCOVERY THAT MR. BALWANI IS ATTEMPTING TO TAKE IN THE 01:44PM 19 CIVIL CASE RELATING TO DOCTORS AND PATIENTS WHO IN OUR JUDGMENT 01:44PM 20 HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE S.E.C. CASE BUT EVERYTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIMINAL CASE. 01:44PM 21 01:44PM 22 SO WE THINK SOME OF THE RECENT DISCOVERY HAS CROSSED THE 01:44PM 23 LINE IN TERMS OF RELEVANCE OF THE S.E.C. CASE. WE ALSO TOOK A 01:44PM 24 LOOK AT THE KEATING FACTORS IN THE MOST RECENT NINTH CIRCUIT 01:45PM 25 DECISION ON STAYS, AND WE REALLY THINK THAT THE BREADTH OF

1 01:45PM 2 01:45PM 3 01:45PM 01:45PM 4 01:45PM 01:45PM 6 01:45PM 7 01:45PM 8 01:45PM 9 01:45PM 10 01:45PM 11 01:45PM 12 01:45PM 13 01:45PM 14 01:45PM 15 01:45PM 16 01:45PM 17 01:45PM 18 01:46PM 19 01:46PM 20 01:46PM 21 01:46PM 22 01:46PM 23 01:46PM 24 01:46PM 25

CIVIL DISCOVERY IN THE S.E.C. CASE IS DISTRACTING FROM THE PARTIES' ABILITY TO MOVE THE CASE FORWARD AND GET A TRIAL DATE IN THE CRIMINAL CASE.

SO I THINK THOSE ARE -- WE DO NOT TAKE A POSITION ON ANY DISCOVERY MR. BALWANI HAS TAKEN OF THE FDA OR CMS IN THE S.E.C. CASE. IT'S REALLY FOCUSSED ON DOCTORS AND PATIENTS AND THE OVERALL BREADTH OF IT.

MR. COPPERSMITH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. WE'RE
GOING TO RESPOND TO THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO INTERVENE AND
STAY. OUR OPPOSITION IS DUE TWO WEEKS FROM THIS PAST FRIDAY SO
WE INTEND TO PUT IN A FULL OPPOSITION. WE DON'T AGREE WITH THE
GOVERNMENT THERE SHOULD BE A MOTION, BUT LET ME SAY A FEW
THINGS IN RESPONSE TO MR. LEACH.

THE COURT: SURE.

MR. COPPERSMITH: THAT IS, IT'S BEEN ABOUT A YEAR SINCE THE DISCOVERY COMMENCED IN THE S.E.C. CASE.

JUST LIKE IN THE CRIMINAL CASE, THERE ARE MILLIONS OF PAGES OF DOCUMENTS. AS WE SEE THE S.E.C. CASE, AND WE PUT THIS IN THE STATUS REPORT FOR YOUR HONOR, WE BELIEVE THERE ARE ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THE CAPABILITIES OF THERANOS'S LABORATORIES AND ITS ANALYZER AND IT NOT BEING ACCURATE. WE'VE ACTUALLY TRIED TO PROPOSE SOME THINGS TO THE S.E.C. WE HAVEN'T HEARD BACK. WE THINK IT PUTS THESE MATTERS AT ISSUE.

THE MATTER WITH RESPECT TO THE HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS,

JUDGE COUSINS IS GOING TO HEAR THAT MOTION ON RELEVANCE ON

WEDNESDAY AND JUDGE COUSINS IS GOING TO BE WELL CAPABLE TO 1 01:46PM 2 DECIDING WHAT IS RELEVANT IN THE CASE AND WHAT IS NOT, AND WE 01:46PM THINK IT'S RELEVANT. 3 01:46PM BUT IN ADDITION, THE FACT THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAITED A 01:46PM 4 YEAR TO TRY TO STAY AFTER MR. BALWANI PROVIDED DISCOVERY TO THE 01:46PM S.E.C., HE PROVIDED SWORN INTERROGATORY ANSWERS, HE PROVIDED 01:46PM 6 01:46PM 7 OTHER DISCOVERY, SAT FOR THREE DAYS FOR TESTIMONY WITH THE S.E.C. BEFORE THE COMPLAINT WAS FILED. 8 01:46PM TO COME IN AND TRY TO STAY AT THIS POINT I THINK IS 01:46PM 9 01:46PM 10 TACTICAL, BUT WE'LL EXPLAIN ALL OF OUR --01:46PM 11 THE COURT: YOU'RE ARGUING THE MOTION. 01:46PM 12 MR. COOPERSMITH: WELL, I MEAN, I'M RESPONDING TO MR. LEACH. 01:46PM 13 THE COURT: JUNE 10TH, I THINK. 01:47PM 14 01:47PM 15 MR. COPPERSMITH: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND I DON'T THINK THAT THAT MOTION SHOULD REALLY AFFECT ANYTHING THAT WE'RE 01:47PM 16 01:47PM 17 DOING TODAY NOTWITHSTANDING MR. LEACH'S COMMENTS. 01:47PM 18 SO ONE OTHER THING THAT MAY BE IS PERTINENT AND THAT IS, 01:47PM 19 THERE IS, AND I THINK WE MENTIONED THIS IN THE STATUS REPORT, 01:47PM 20 TOO, THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH CMS AND FDA ON THE CIVIL SIDE JUST 01:47PM 21 LIKE IN THE CRIMINAL CASE AND THERE WERE SUBPOENAS ISSUED TO 01:47PM 22 THOSE AGENCIES OUT OF THE CIVIL CASE. THE S.E.C. DIDN'T OBJECT 01:47PM 23 TO ANYTHING ABOUT RELEVANCE ON THOSE UNTIL VERY RECENTLY. 01:47PM 24 AFTER SEVEN MONTHS THOSE SUBPOENAS WERE PENDING. 01:47PM 25 WE'VE BEEN CONFERRING, MEETING AND CONFERRING WITH CMS AND

01:47PM	1	FDA AND DOJ COUNSEL WHO REPRESENTS THOSE AGENCIES FOR MANY,
01:47PM	2	MANY MONTHS. WE'RE TRYING TO FRAME THOSE ISSUES FOR THE COURT
01:47PM	3	IF WE CAN'T RESOLVE THEM. OBVIOUSLY, WE HOPE WE CAN RESOLVE
01:47PM	4	THEM. BUT THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE'VE BEEN STRUGGLING WITH
01:47PM	5	FOR YOU KNOW, SINCE SEPTEMBER SINCE WE ISSUED THOSE
01:47PM	6	SUBPOENAS IS TO ACTUALLY GET THOSE AGENCIES TO PROVIDE
01:47PM	7	DOCUMENTS.
01:48PM	8	THAT IS WHAT IS GOING ON.
01:48PM	9	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. ANYTHING FURTHER THEN
01:48PM	10	ON THAT? SHOULD WE LEAVE THE JUNE 10TH DATE THEN? IS THAT
01:48PM	11	CONVENIENT?
01:48PM	12	MR. COOPERSMITH: THAT WAS THE DATE AVAILABLE FOR
01:48PM	13	US, SO, YES, YOUR HONOR.
01:48PM	14	MR. LEACH: IT'S CONVENIENT FOR US, YOUR HONOR, IF
01:48PM	15	THE COURT IS AVAILABLE TO GO FORWARD.
01:48PM	16	THE COURT: I THINK THAT'S AT 10:00 A.M.
01:48PM	17	THE CLERK: YES, YOUR HONOR.
01:48PM	18	THE COURT: LET'S LEAVE THAT SET. LET'S RETURN NOW
01:48PM	19	TO THE CRIMINAL CASE.
01:48PM	20	WHAT DO YOU SUGGEST THEN? I UNDERSTAND YOU'LL PERHAPS
01:48PM	21	PROVIDE A MEMO PERHAPS THE WEEK AFTER, MAYBE IT'S THE SECOND
01:48PM	22	WEEK OF MAY OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, MR. BOSTIC.
01:48PM	23	MR. BOSTIC: THAT'S WHAT I UNDERSTAND FROM DEFENSE'S
01:48PM	24	PROPOSAL, YOUR HONOR, AND THAT MEMO WOULD EITHER SAY THE
01:48PM	25	PARTIES HAVE REACHED THE FOLLOWING AGREEMENT OR ARE MAKING

1 01:48PM 2 01:48PM 3 01:48PM 01:48PM 4 01:48PM 01:49PM 01:49PM 7 01:49PM 8 01:49PM 9 01:49PM 10 01:49PM 11 01:49PM 12 01:49PM 13 01:49PM 14 01:49PM 15 01:49PM 16 01:49PM 17 01:49PM 18 01:49PM 19 01:49PM 20 01:49PM 21 01:49PM 22 01:49PM 23 01:49PM 24 01:49PM 25

PROGRESS TOWARDS REACHING THIS AGREEMENT OR IT WOULD INDICATE
THAT THERE IS NO SUCH AGREEMENT AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS
PLANNING TO FILE ITS OPPOSITION. THEN MY HOPE AT THAT TIME
WOULD BE THAT THE PARTIES INCLUDE IN THAT FILING A PROPOSED
BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE.

## IS THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING?

MR. DOWNEY: THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING, TOO.

THE COURT: I'LL GIVE YOU AN OPPORTUNITY AND THE

OPPORTUNITY TO CREATE SUCH A SCHEDULE THAT COMPORTS WITH YOUR

CALENDARS. I'M HAPPY TO GIVE THAT TO YOU FOR SUGGESTION TO THE

COURT, AND IF WE CAN ACCOMMODATE IT, WE WILL. I'LL ACCEPT THAT

FOR YOU.

LET'S TALK ABOUT TRIAL FOR JUST A MOMENT. I REALIZE THAT

IT'S GOING TO BE PREMATURE BASED ON THESE PENDING MOTIONS. BUT

WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS, IF YOU HAVE ANY, ABOUT WHEN THE CASE

WOULD PROCEED TO TRIAL, IF IT WERE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL, WHEN

THAT MIGHT BE?

MR. DOWNEY: I THINK FROM THE DEFENSE PERSPECTIVE AT THIS POINT, JUDGE, WE'RE ABOUT THREE MONTHS TOO EARLY TO DISCUSS THAT.

IN ADDITION TO WHAT WE'VE JUST DISCUSSED, THERE ARE A COUPLE OF OTHER STRANDS THAT ARE GOING TO DEFINE, I THINK, THE SCOPE OF WHAT IS AT ISSUE.

ONE IS THAT THERE IS A TAINT TEAM THAT IS IN PLACE FOR PURPOSES OF REVIEW OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS, AND THERE'S A

1 01:49PM 2 01:50PM 3 01:50PM 01:50PM 4 01:50PM 01:50PM 01:50PM 7 8 01:50PM 01:50PM 9 01:50PM 10 01:50PM 11 01:50PM 12 01:50PM 13 01:50PM 14 01:50PM 15 01:50PM 16 01:50PM 17 01:50PM 18 01:50PM 19 01:51PM 20 01:51PM 21 01:51PM 22 01:51PM 23 01:51PM 24

01:51PM 25

PROCEDURE THAT ATTACHES TO THE BACK END OF THAT WHERE THE DEFENSE CAN OBJECT IF DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE DISCLOSED TO THE GOVERNMENT.

THE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE AT ISSUE THERE I THINK ARE GOING TO BE QUITE MATERIAL TO THE CASE, AND WE DON'T AT THIS POINT KNOW WHAT THE STATUS IS OF THAT REVIEW, WHEN WE'LL GET THOSE DOCUMENTS, ET CETERA, BUT I THINK THAT IS A PROCESS THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS SAID HAS COMMENCED AND WE WILL, I THINK, PRESUMABLY BE IN THAT PROCESS THREE MONTHS FROM NOW AND HAVE A BETTER SENSE WITH CLARITY AS TO WHEN WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE TRIAL DATE.

THE OTHER PIECE OF IT, WHICH I JUST, FRANKLY, HAVE TO SOME EXTENT THROW MY HANDS UP ON, JUDGE, AND SAY WE HAVE A HUGE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN PRODUCED WHICH I THINK THE GOVERNMENT HAS WORKED DILIGENTLY TO PRODUCE BUT MUCH OF WHICH WE HAVE ONLY RECENTLY GOTTEN. WE'RE TOLD BY THE GOVERNMENT THAT THEY ARE PRODUCING A LARGE ADDITIONAL VOLUME. INDEED, TODAY MR. BOSTIC HAS UNCOVERED THAT FOUR ADDITIONAL TERABYTES OF DATA ARE GOING TO BE DISCLOSED TO US. SO WE WANT TO GET OUR ARMS AROUND WHAT THAT IS, AS DOES HE.

SO I THINK WE'RE THREE MONTHS OUT FROM WRAPPING THOSE

STRANDS UP SO THAT WE CAN KNOW WHEN A TRIAL DATE -- WHEN A

RANGE FOR A TRIAL DATE WOULD BE APPROPRIATE AND SUGGEST A LEAD

TIME TO YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WELL, THAT COMPORTS WITH WHAT YOU'RE

01:51PM	1	SUGGESTING A JULY DATE FOR A STATUS CONFERENCE.
01:51PM	2	MR. DOWNEY: STATUS CONFERENCE, YES.
01:51PM	3	MR. BOSTIC: YOUR HONOR, JUST TO UPDATE THE COURT ON
01:51PM	4	THE TWO ISSUES JUST MENTIONED BY DEFENSE COUNSEL.
01:51PM	5	FIRST, ON THE TAINT REVIEW, COUNSEL IS CORRECT THAT THAT
01:51PM	6	PROCESS IS ONGOING. IN FACT, THE GOVERNMENT IS ABOUT TO CLEAR
01:51PM	7	THE FIRST BATCH OF DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW BY THE DEFENSE. I
01:51PM	8	BELIEVE THAT SET OF DOCUMENTS WILL INCLUDE WELL IN EXCESS OF
01:51PM	9	100,000 OUT OF THE APPROXIMATELY 250,000 DOCUMENTS THAT ARE
01:51PM	10	UNDERGOING THAT TAINT REVIEW. SO WE'RE MAKING GOOD PROGRESS ON
01:51PM	11	THAT, AND IT'S MY HOPE THAT VERY SOON THE DEFENSE WILL HAVE
01:51PM	12	ACCESS TO A VERY LARGE PORTION OF THOSE DOCUMENTS AND THEN
01:51PM	13	WE'LL PROCEED DILIGENTLY WITH THE REST.
01:51PM	14	AS TO THE NEW INFORMATION, I DID INFORM COUNSEL FOR
01:52PM	15	MS. HOLMES BEFORE THE HEARING THAT WE RECENTLY OBTAINED
01:52PM	16	VOLUNTARILY FROM A WITNESS A HARD DRIVE CONTAINING
01:52PM	17	APPROXIMATELY FOUR TERABYTES OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. I
01:52PM	18	UNDERSTAND THAT MOST OF THAT VOLUME COMES FROM PROMOTIONAL FILM
01:52PM	19	AND VIDEO CREATED BY THERANOS ITSELF WHEN THE COMPANY WAS
01:52PM	20	OPERATIONAL. SO I THINK THE LARGE AMOUNT MIGHT BE SOMEWHAT
01:52PM	21	MISLEADING BECAUSE THESE ARE NOT JUST PAGES OF SOLID DOCUMENTS.
01:52PM	22	I THINK A LOT OF THAT DATA IS MADE UP BY VIDEO FILES.
01:52PM	23	THE COURT: I SEE. THAT'S HELPFUL.
01:52PM	24	MR. SCHENK?
01:52PM	25	MR. SCHENK: YES, YOUR HONOR. ON THE ISSUE OF

1 01:52PM 2 01:52PM 3 01:52PM 01:52PM 4 01:52PM 01:52PM 6 01:52PM 7 01:53PM 8 01:53PM 9 01:53PM 10 01:53PM 11 01:53PM 12 01:53PM 13 01:53PM 14 01:53PM 15 01:53PM 16 01:53PM 17 01:53PM 18 01:53PM 19 01:53PM 20 01:53PM 21 01:53PM 22 01:53PM 23 01:53PM 24 01:54PM 25

SETTING A TRIAL DATE, WE DO THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE TO SET A TRIAL DATE. WE'RE NOT ASKING THE COURT TO SET A TRIAL DATE IN THREE MONTHS OR SIX MONTHS, BUT IT DOES HELP CRYSTALIZE MANY OF THE ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT AND BEFORE THE PARTIES TO HAVE THAT TRIAL DATE.

WE ALSO THINK THAT THE TRIAL WILL BE LENGTHY AND TO

RESERVE THE BLOCK OF TIME ON THE COURT'S CALENDAR AND ON ALL OF

THE PARTIES' CALENDAR AND SO THAT WE CAN SEND TRIAL SUBPOENAS

TO WITNESSES TO BEGIN TO BLOCK OUT TIME. IT'S HELPFUL TO HAVE

A TRIAL DATE.

WE THINK THAT TO NOT MEASURE BY COURT WEEKS BUT RATHER

TRIAL DAYS, OUR ESTIMATE AT THIS POINT WOULD BE ABOUT 40 TRIAL

DAYS THOUGH ACKNOWLEDGING WE HOPE THAT WE'RE ABLE TO REACH SOME

STIPULATIONS WITH THE DEFENSE TO ALLEVIATE CUSTODIAL WITNESSES,

AND OBVIOUSLY AS THE TRIAL WOULD GET CLOSER, WE WOULD BE ABLE

TO PROVIDE A MORE ACCURATE OR A BETTER ESTIMATE.

BUT AT THIS POINT, YOU KNOW, THAT'S ROUGHLY TWO MONTHS

GOING EVERY COURT DAY SO IT'S PROBABLY GOING TO GO A LITTLE BIT

LONGER THAN THAT AND TO GET TWO MONTHS ON THE COURT'S CALENDAR

IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO ON SHORT NOTICE.

SO WE WOULD ASK THE COURT TO THINK ABOUT SETTING US FOR TRIAL EVEN A YEAR FROM NOW. THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST WOULD BE TO SET THE TRIAL DATE.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE THE POINTS THAT THE DEFENSE HAS MADE TO THE COURT ABOUT THE VOLUMINOUS DISCOVERY AND THEIR NEED TO REVIEW

01:54PM	1	THAT DISCOVERY. A YEAR FROM NOW, THOUGH, WE THINK WOULD
01:54PM	2	ACCOMPLISH THAT. AND WE SHOULD ALSO NOTE THAT A LOT OF THE
01:54PM	3	DISCOVERY PRODUCTION IN THIS CASE IS AN EXERCISE IN PROVIDING
01:54PM	4	THERANOS DOCUMENTS BACK TO THE DEFENSE. NOW IT'S INDIVIDUAL
01:54PM	5	DEFENDANTS, NOT THE CORPORATION. THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF
01:54PM	6	LITIGATION THAT HAS PREDATED THE CRIMINAL CASE.
01:54PM	7	SO THEY'VE RECEIVED SOME OF THESE DOCUMENTS AND NOW TWO OR
01:54PM	8	THREE TIMES FROM US, BUT WE ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR NEED TO
01:54PM	9	EFFECTIVELY PREPARE BY REVIEWING THESE DOCUMENTS. THEY HAVE
01:54PM	10	NOT WALKED IN AND ASKED FOR A SPEEDY TRIAL BECAUSE OF THE
01:54PM	11	VOLUMINOUS NATURE OF THE DISCOVERY.
01:54PM	12	ALTHOUGH IT IS OUR VIEW THAT SETTING A TRIAL DATE NOW IS
01:54PM	13	IMPORTANT TO CRYSTALLIZE THOSE ISSUES AND TO BLOCK THAT TIME
01:54PM	14	OUT ON THE COURT'S CALENDAR.
01:54PM	15	AGAIN, EVEN IF IT'S A YEAR FROM NOW WHEN THE COURT HAS THE
01:54PM	16	TIME TO GIVE US THOSE TWO-PLUS MONTHS, WE WOULD APPRECIATE IT.
01:54PM	17	THE COURT: OKAY.
01:54PM	18	MR. DOWNEY: YOUR HONOR
01:54PM	19	THE COURT: WELL, LOOKING AHEAD I KNOW YOU CAN'T
01:55PM	20	TELL ME TODAY, COUNSEL, YOU CAN'T TELL ME TODAY WHAT YOUR
01:55PM	21	THE TIME YOU NEED FOR YOUR DEFENSE.
01:55PM	22	MR. DOWNEY: NO.
01:55PM	23	THE COURT: BUT MY SENSE IS THAT IT MIGHT MIRROR
01:55PM	24	THIS AS WELL AND PERHAPS BE LONGER.
01:55PM	25	MR. COOPERSMITH: YES, YOUR HONOR.

MR. DOWNEY: THAT'S OUR SENSE, YOUR HONOR, FROM WHAT 01:55PM 1 THE GOVERNMENT HAS SAID TO US. 2 01:55PM THE COURT: SO RECOGNIZING THE BUSINESS OF FEDERAL 3 01:55PM 01:55PM 4 DISTRICT COURTS IN THIS -- IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, AND PARTICULARLY THE SAN JOSE DIVISION, IF I CAN 01:55PM 01:55PM 6 SAY THAT, WE'RE BUSY. 01:55PM 7 MR. DOWNEY: I SEE. THE COURT: IT WOULD MAKE SENSE FOR MY CALENDAR, AND 01:55PM 8 MY COLLEAGUES AS WELL, TO BLOCK OUT SOME TIME, EXPECTATION SO 01:55PM 9 01:55PM 10 THAT WE CAN PROPERLY ADJUST OUR CALENDAR FOR THE OTHER CASES 01:55PM 11 THAT WE HAVE NEED TO TAKE CARE OF. 01:56PM 12 IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO TODAY? 01:56PM 13 MR. DOWNEY: YOUR HONOR, CAN I MAKE A SUGGESTION? 01:56PM 14 EVERYTHING THAT MR. SCHENK SAYS IS SENSIBLE. THIS IS GOING TO 01:56PM 15 BE A LONG TRIAL, AND IT'S GOING TO REQUIRE A LOT OF COORDINATION, AND I THINK A SIGNIFICANT ADVANCE NOTICE IS 01:56PM 16 01:56PM 17 APPROPRIATE. 01:56PM 18 I REALLY DO THINK WHEN THE PROCESSES I'VE IDENTIFIED HAVE 01:56PM 19 HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO PLAY OUT, WE'LL BE IN A BETTER POSITION 01:56PM 20 TO SAY WHETHER THAT'S NINE MONTHS FROM JULY, WHICH WOULD STILL 01:56PM 21 BE A YEAR FROM TODAY, OR WHETHER IT'S A YEAR FROM JULY. I 01:56PM 22 THINK THE WORST POSSIBLE RESULT, WHICH WE ALL AGREE ON AND 01:56PM 23 WHICH I'M SURE THE COURT AGREES ON, IS GETTING CLOSER TO A 01:56PM 24 TRIAL AND UNEXPECTED EVENTS THAT CHANGE THE TRIAL DATE. 01:56PM 25 SO I WILL COMMIT TO THE COURT THAT WE WILL TRY TO GIVE A

1 01:56PM 2 01:56PM 3 01:56PM 01:56PM 4 01:57PM 01:57PM 01:57PM 8 01:57PM 01:57PM 9 01:57PM 10 01:57PM 11 01:57PM 12 01:57PM 13 01:57PM 14 01:57PM 15 01:57PM 16 01:57PM 17 01:57PM 18 01:57PM 19 01:57PM 20 01:57PM 21 01:57PM 22 01:58PM 23 01:58PM 24 01:58PM 25

RELIABLE TRIAL DATE AS I'M SURE THE GOVERNMENT WILL WHEN WE PROPOSE ONE. BUT MY SUGGESTION WOULD BE THAT WE CONFER IN ADVANCE OF A JULY CONFERENCE, COME UP WITH A PROPOSED SCHEDULE, ASSUMING THE ISSUES THAT WE'VE IDENTIFIED ARE RESOLVED AND KNOWABLE AT THAT POINT, AND COME BACK AT THAT TIME AND TRY TO IDENTIFY WHAT THE APPROPRIATE LENGTH OF TIME IS AND WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PRECISE SCHEDULING IS SO THAT WHEN THE COURT SCHEDULES THOSE DATES IT CAN HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEM.

MR. COOPERSMITH: YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD ADD ONE THING. SO THE GOVERNMENT ON THE CRIMINAL SIDE HERE HAS BEEN INVESTIGATING THIS CASE SINCE SOMETHING LIKE EARLY 2016 AND HAS -- IT'S NOW, YOU KNOW, SINCE THE INDICTMENT WAS IN JUNE OR MID-JUNE OF 2018 AND WE JUST RECEIVED 3 MILLION PAGES OF DOCUMENTS, YOU KNOW, IN THE MIDDLE OF MARCH. SO JUST VERY RECENTLY.

SO IT IS OBVIOUSLY VERY DIFFICULT TO REVIEW ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS, BUT THE THING I WANTED TO SAY IN PARTICULAR THAT HASN'T BEEN MENTIONED YET IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS SAID THAT IT'S CONTINUING TO INVESTIGATE THIS CASE. IT'S CONTINUING TO USE THE GRAND JURY, IT'S CONTINUING TO DO THAT.

IF WE SET THE STATUS HEARING IN JULY AS SUGGESTED IN THE STATUS REPORT AND WE ALL COME BACK AND AT THAT POINT WE'RE ALL PREPARED TO TALK ABOUT A TRIAL DATE, I'M HOPING THAT THE GOVERNMENT WILL BE IN A POSITION TO SAY WHETHER THE CASE AS CHARGED NOW IS WHAT THE CASE IS OR WHETHER IT'S GOING TO BE

1 01:58PM 2 01:58PM 3 01:58PM 01:58PM 4 01:58PM 01:58PM 6 01:58PM 7 8 01:58PM 01:58PM 9 01:58PM 10 01:58PM 11 01:58PM 12 01:58PM 13 01:58PM 14 01:58PM 15 01:58PM 16 01:58PM 17 01:59PM 18 01:59PM 19 01:59PM 20 01:59PM 21 01:59PM 22

01:59PM 23

01:59PM 24

01:59PM 25

SOMETHING DIFFERENT.

YOU KNOW, CERTAINLY BY JULY THEY OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT IF THEY'RE NOT PREPARED TO DO THAT TODAY.

THE COURT: IT SOUNDS LIKE A REQUEST.

MR. SCHENK: YOUR HONOR, WE APPRECIATE THE REQUEST.

WE RESPECTFULLY ARE GOING TO DECLINE TO TAKE MR. COOPERSMITH UP

ON THAT REQUEST.

IF HIS CONCERN IS BEING SHORT SET; THAT IS, GOING TO TRIAL ON AN INDICTMENT THAT WAS NOT THE INDICTMENT THAT HE WAS EXPECTING TO GO TO TRIAL ON, THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT 3161 DEALS WITH THAT SCENARIO. THERE IS LAW ON THAT SUBJECT.

IF IT ISN'T THAT AND RATHER IT'S JUST TELL US IF YOU'RE
STILL INVESTIGATING US AND IF YOU'RE LIKELY TO FACE MORE
CRIMINAL CHARGES, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE DON'T DO AND UNLESS
THE COURT WOULD ORDER US TO WE WOULD ASK TO BE HEARD ON THE
ISSUE. WE'RE NOT INCLINED TO REVEAL ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS.

THE COURT: PERHAPS THAT WAS AN ASPIRATIONAL

STATEMENT. WELL, LET'S -- WHY DON'T WE -- IT SEEMS TO ME THAT

I'D LIKE TO GET SOME CLOSURE ON CAPTURING A SERIES OF -- IT

SOUNDS LIKE WE'RE GOING TO CAPTURE A SERIES OF MONTHS THAT THE

TRIAL WILL BE IN, AND OF COURSE WE'LL HAVE TO TIME QUALIFY, ET

CETERA, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO CAPTURE SOME TIME CERTAIN IF WE CAN

SO THAT WE CAN RESERVE THAT TIME FOR ALL OF YOU FOR THE WORK

THAT YOU NEED TO DO.

PERHAPS WE CAN BEST DO THAT IN JULY, AND I'M LOOKING AT

01:59PM	1	OUR CALENDAR THINKING JULY 1ST OR JULY 8TH.
01:59PM	2	DO YOU HAVE A PREFERENCE, ADRIANA?
01:59PM	3	THE CLERK: FOR FURTHER STATUS, YOUR HONOR?
01:59PM	4	THE COURT: YES.
01:59PM	5	THE CLERK: JULY 1ST IS A BETTER DATE FOR THE COURT.
01:59PM	6	MR. DOWNEY: THAT'S FINE FOR MS. HOLMES.
01:59PM	7	THE COURT: ANY OBJECTION TO JULY 1ST?
02:00PM	8	MR. COOPERSMITH: NO, YOUR HONOR.
02:00PM	9	MR. BOSTIC: THAT'S FINE FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
02:00PM	10	MR. SCHENK: NO.
02:00PM	11	THE COURT: I HEAR NONE. THANK YOU. THAT WILL
02:00PM	12	ALLOW US ALSO TO HEAR THE JUNE 10TH MOTION SO WE'LL HAVE SOME
02:00PM	13	RESOLUTION ON THE JUNE 10TH MOTION WHICH MAY BE HELPFUL, AND
02:00PM	14	DEPENDING ON YOUR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS DISCOVERY ISSUE,
02:00PM	15	WHATEVER REMAINS MIGHT MAKE THAT MOTION LESS INTENSIVE AS IT
02:00PM	16	PRESENTS NOW. OF COURSE, I ONLY HAVE ONE SIDE OF IT.
02:00PM	17	ALL RIGHT. LET'S CONTINUE THESE CASES. ANYTHING FROM THE
02:00PM	18	S.E.C. THAT I SHOULD KNOW ABOUT?
02:00PM	19	MS. LAMARCA: YES, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS MORE IN THE
02:00PM	20	NATURE OF HOUSEKEEPING BUT CURRENTLY THE COURT HAS A MAY 30TH
02:00PM	21	DATE FOR SETTING A TRIAL IN THIS CASE AND THE LAST TIME THAT WE
02:00PM	22	MET THE S.E.C. HAD AGREED, AT THE DEFENDANT'S REQUEST, TO ALLOW
02:00PM	23	FOR A POTENTIAL EXTENSION OF OUR DISCOVERY CUTOFF.
02:01PM	24	THE COURT: RIGHT.
02:01PM	25	MS. LAMARCA: I GET THAT THIS MAY CHANGE GIVEN THE

1 02:01PM 2 02:01PM 3 02:01PM 02:01PM 4 02:01PM 02:01PM 02:01PM 7 8 02:01PM 02:01PM 9 02:01PM 10 02:01PM 11 02:01PM 12 02:01PM 13 02:01PM 14 02:01PM 15 02:01PM 16 02:01PM 17 02:02PM 18 02:02PM 19 02:02PM 20 02:02PM 21 02:02PM 22 02:02PM 23 02:02PM 24 02:02PM 25

STAY MOTION, ET CETERA, AND WE'RE WILLING TO DEFER THAT ISSUE
UNTIL THE FUTURE, BUT I DO THINK THAT SINCE THE MOTION HAS BEEN
SET FOR JUNE 10TH, WE AT LEAST NEED TO TAKE CARE OF THIS MAY
30TH DATE IN THE INTERIM.

MR. COOPERSMITH: THAT MAKES SENSE, YOUR HONOR, THAT WE MOVE THE MAY 30TH. I AGREE WITH MS. LAMARCA.

REGARDING THE STAY MOTION, AS THE COURT ALREADY SAID THAT WILL BE HEARD ON JUNE 10TH, AND WE'LL RESPOND, AND I'M SURE THE GOVERNMENT WILL SUBMIT A REPLY BRIEF.

BUT I THINK THAT THE REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE OR AN EXTENSION OF DISCOVERY SHOULD BE RULED AND DECIDED ON TODAY, AND THERE'S A FEW REASONS FOR THAT.

FIRST OF ALL, THE S.E.C. AND THE DEFENSE FOR MR. BALWANI
AGREE THAT THERE SHOULD AN EXTENSION OF DISCOVERY. WE DISAGREE
ABOUT EXACTLY WHAT THE LENGTH SHOULD BE. THEY SAID UP TO 3
MONTHS, AND WE THINK THE MAGNITUDE OF THIS CASE AND THE VOLUME
OF DOCUMENTS WARRANT AN EXTENSION OF 12 MONTHS, BUT WE AGREE ON
AN EXTENSION.

SO IF THAT CAN BE DECIDED UPON, THAT WAY WHAT WILL HAPPEN IS THAT IF THE COURT DENIES THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO STAY, WE'LL BE IN A POSITION TO CONTINUE TO TAKE DISCOVERY AND ALSO RIGHT NOW WE'LL BE ABLE TO GET THINGS ON THE CALENDAR, BECAUSE AS I SAID THE LAST TIME I WAS BEFORE THE COURT, SOME OF THESE WITNESSES ARE BILLIONAIRES AND OTHERS OF THAT ILK WHO MAKE IT VERY DIFFICULT TO SCHEDULE, AND WE TRY TO BE COURTEOUS IN

02:02PM	1	SCHEDULING TIME FOR THAT THOSE PEOPLE.
02:02PM	2	THE COURT: THEY HAVEN'T MET THE UNITED STATES
02:02PM	3	MARSHAL.
02:02PM	4	MR. COOPERSMITH: IF IT CAME TO THAT I SUPPOSE THEY
02:02PM	5	COULD, BUT WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE THAT SITUATION IF WE CAN AVOID
02:02PM	6	IT.
02:02PM	7	(LAUGHTER.)
02:02PM	8	MR. COOPERSMITH: BUT, YOUR HONOR, IF WE AGREE ON
02:02PM	9	THE EXTENSION OR THE COURT RULES ON AN EXTENSION TODAY,
02:02PM	10	OBVIOUSLY IF ON JUNE 10TH THE COURT DOES STAY THE CASE, OVER
02:02PM	11	OUR OPPOSITION, THEN THAT WILL BE THE END OF DISCOVERY UNTIL
02:02PM	12	SOME OTHER POINT IN TIME.
02:02PM	13	THE COURT: I APPRECIATE THAT. I THINK A YEAR STAY
02:02PM	14	IS A LITTLE THAT'S JUST A BRIDGE TOO FAR TODAY FOR ME TO
02:03PM	15	MAKE.
02:03PM	16	ANYTHING FURTHER ON THAT?
02:03PM	17	AND PERHAPS I DON'T MEAN TO SUGGEST THAT DISCOVERY
02:03PM	18	SHOULD BE INCREMENTAL AT ALL. I'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU FULL
02:03PM	19	LATITUDE OF DISCOVERY THAT YOU NEED, BUT I DO THINK THAT IN ALL
02:03PM	20	CANDOR A YEAR IS A BIT MUCH, AND I WAS LOOKING AT 90 DAYS AND
02:03PM	21	PERHAPS WE CAN START WITH THAT AND SEE WHERE WE GO.
02:03PM	22	EVERYTHING IS KIND OF FLUID HERE IN ANY EVENT.
02:03PM	23	MR. COOPERSMITH: I UNDERSTAND WHAT THE COURT IS
02:03PM	24	SAYING OF COURSE. THE PROBLEM IS, YOUR HONOR, IF WE ONLY HAVE
02:03PM	25	A THREE-MONTH EXTENSION, WE'RE NOW GOING TO BE IN THE SUMMER

02:03PM	1	TOWARDS THE END OF THAT PERIOD. IT'S GOING TO BE VERY	
02:03PM	2	DIFFICULT TO SCHEDULE THINGS FOR SOME WITNESSES,	
02:03PM	3	NOTWITHSTANDING THE POWER OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS, YOUR	
02:03PM	4	HONOR, AND	
02:03PM	5	THE COURT: YOU UNDERESTIMATE THEM.	
02:03PM	6	MR. COOPERSMITH: NO, I DON'T. I WAS A FEDERAL	
02:03PM	7	PROSECUTOR, AND I HAVE TOTAL FAITH IN THE PARTIALS, BUT I DON'T	
02:03PM	8	THINK THAT'S WHERE WE REALLY WANT TO BE.	
02:03PM	9	THE COURT: SURE. I APPRECIATE THAT.	
02:03PM	10	MR. COOPERSMITH: SO THE PROBLEM IS IN SOME CASES	
02:04PM	11	WE'RE ALREADY TALKING TO WITNESSES, ASSUMING THERE WAS ANY	
02:04PM	12	EXTENSION, OF SCHEDULING THINGS IN JULY, AND THAT'S THREE	
02:04PM	13	MONTHS FROM NOW.	
02:04PM	14	SO I THINK IT'S GOING TO MAKE IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR	
02:04PM	15	SCHEDULING PURPOSES IF WE HAVE ONLY A THREE MONTH EXTENSION	
02:04PM	16	GIVEN THAT WILL BE RIGHT AT THE SUMMER PERIOD AT THAT POINT.	
02:04PM	17	SO IF THE COURT IS NOT WILLING TO GRANT A 12-MONTH	
02:04PM	18	EXTENSION, OBVIOUSLY THAT'S WHAT WE REQUESTED, SOME PERIOD OF	
02:04PM	19	TIME BETWEEN THE 3 MONTHS THE S.E.C. SAID AND THE 12 MONTHS	
02:04PM	20	WE'RE SAYING WOULD MAKE SENSE.	
02:04PM	21	AGAIN, YOU KNOW, THE STAY MOTION WON'T AFFECT IT BECAUSE	
02:04PM	22	THE COURT CAN RULE ON JUNE 10TH ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.	
02:04PM	23	MS. LAMARCA: YOUR HONOR, WE OPPOSE A LONGER	
02:04PM	24	EXTENSION FOR THE REASONS THAT WE SET FORTH IN THE JOINT CMC	
02:04PM	25	STATEMENT. I THINK ONE THING THAT WE HAVE NOT SEEN IN THIS	

1 02:04PM 2 02:04PM 3 02:04PM 02:04PM 4 02:04PM 02:05PM 02:05PM 7 8 02:05PM 02:05PM 9 02:05PM 10 02:05PM 11 02:05PM 12 02:05PM 13 02:05PM 14 02:05PM 15 02:05PM 16 02:05PM 17 02:05PM 18 02:05PM 19 02:05PM 20 02:05PM 21 02:05PM 22 02:06PM 23 02:06PM 24

02:06PM 25

CASE IS ANYTHING OTHER THAN ARGUMENTS ABOUT THINGS LIKE
DISCOVERY, AND IT IS, NO DOUBT, DIFFICULT TO GET SOME WITNESSES
TO AGREE TO CERTAIN DATES, BUT WE DO IT ALL OF THE TIME.
THAT'S WHAT WE DO.

AND IN OUR CASES A THREE MONTH EXTENSION USUALLY WORKS FOR EVERYONE. SO I CAN'T IMAGINE IF THIS IS SO DIFFERENT THAT IT REALLY REQUIRES THAT WE DEPART FROM THE NORMS IN ALL OF OUR CASES. WE WOULD OPPOSE ANYTHING LONGER THAN THREE MONTHS.

MR. COOPERSMITH: YOUR HONOR, ONE OTHER THING ABOUT THAT. AS WE SAID IN THE STATUS REPORT, EVERY STEP OF THE WAY WE HAVE RUN INTO NOTHING BUT OBSTACLES WITH SCHEDULING WITNESSES FOR DEPOSITIONS, FOR DOCUMENTS. EVEN WHEN IT COMES TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ITSELF, WE ISSUED SUBPOENAS TO CMS AND FDA, AS I SAID BEFORE, IN SEPTEMBER OF 2018, AND WE'VE MET AND CONFERRED FOR MONTHS, AND MONTHS, AND MONTHS AND NOW WE ARE TRYING TO FRAME THE ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT IF WE HAVE TO GO TO THE MOTION.

IT'S ONE THING AFTER ANOTHER. I CAN TELL YOU THESE THIRD PARTIES, THESE BILLIONAIRES AND OTHERS, NOT SURPRISINGLY, THEY REALLY DON'T WANT TO HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE. THEY HAVE BIG LAW FIRMS REPRESENTING THEM. IT'S NOT THAT WE'RE POWERLESS, YOUR HONOR. WE UNDERSTAND WE CAN PUT OUR FOOT DOWN. WE HAVE IN SOME INSTANCES. IT'S VERY DIFFICULT, AND AS WE HAVE SAID, WE HAVE RUN INTO NOTHING BUT OBSTACLES.

IN ADDITION, AS WE SAID IN THE STATUS REPORT, WE LEARNED

1 02:06PM 2 02:06PM 3 02:06PM 02:06PM 4 02:06PM 02:06PM 02:06PM 7 02:06PM 8 02:06PM 9 02:06PM 10 02:06PM 11 02:06PM 12 02:06PM 13 02:06PM 14 02:06PM 15 02:06PM 16 02:06PM 17 02:06PM 18 02:06PM 19 02:07PM 20 02:07PM 21 02:07PM 22 02:07PM 23 02:07PM 24 02:07PM 25

THAT THE S.E.C. HAD DOCUMENTS FROM SOME AGENCIES FOR A COUPLE OF YEARS, AND, YOU KNOW, HAD NOT PRODUCED THEM INITIALLY AND THEN WE FINALLY DID GET THEM.

I'VE WRITTEN THREE LETTERS, YOUR HONOR, TO COUNSEL FOR THE S.E.C. SAYING CAN YOU PLEASE CONFIRM THAT YOU HAVE EVERY DOCUMENT THAT YOU HAVE FROM THIRD PARTIES AND THAT'S DISCOVERABLE, AND I HAVE NEVER GOTTEN A RESPONSE TO ANY OF THE PARTIES ON THAT POINT.

I UNDERSTAND COUNSEL FOR THE S.E.C. IS BUSY AND THEY HAVE
A LOT OF CASES, BUT THE POSTURE OF THIS CASE RIGHT NOW, I
THINK, FULLY WARRANTS A LONGER EXTENSION THAN THE THREE MONTHS,
AND I THINK THAT WILL MAKE DISCOVERY EFFICIENT.

AGAIN, THE COURT CAN RULE ON THE OTHER ISSUE ON JUNE 10TH.

MS. LAMARCA: WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING FURTHER. WE
DISAGREE WITH COUNSEL'S REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT DISCOVERY IN THIS
CASE SO FAR.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. ANYONE ELSE WISH TO BE HEARD ON THIS? ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WELL, I APPRECIATE YOUR RECOGNIZING ASPIRATIONAL GOALS BUT A YEAR, THAT'S A BRIDGE TOO FAR, AS I'VE SAID. SO 90 DAYS SOUNDS REASONABLE TO ME, BUT I'LL MAKE IT 120 DAYS. I KNOW THAT'S NOT EXACTLY WHAT YOU WANT, BUT WE'LL MAKE IT 120 DAYS AND THEN WE'LL HOPEFULLY -- WELL, WE'LL SEE EACH OTHER JULY 1ST, AND BY THEN WE'LL HAVE SOME KNOWLEDGE AS TO THE JUNE 10TH MOTION AS WELL AND THAT WILL BE HELPFUL AS WELL.

02:07PM	1	MR. COOPERSMITH: JULY 1ST, YOUR HONOR?	
02:07PM	2	THE COURT: YES. JULY 1ST WILL BE OUR NEXT STATUS	
02:07PM	3	CONFERENCE, JULY 1ST, JULY 1ST, AND THAT WILL BE AT 1:30. I	
02:07PM	4	WILL EXCLUDE TIME AS TO EACH DEFENDANT IN EACH CASE TO ALLOW	
02:07PM	5	FOR EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION, AND THERE'S OTHER TERABYTES AND	
02:07PM	6	OTHER DISCOVERY THAT YOU HAVE TALKED ABOUT TODAY THAT COUNSEL	
02:07PM	7	HAS INDICATED THEY NEED TO REVIEW.	
02:07PM	8	ANY OBJECTION TO THE COURT EXCLUDING TIME ON THAT BASIS?	
02:07PM	9	MR. DOWNEY: NO OBJECTION FOR MS. HOLMES.	
02:08PM	10	MR. COOPERSMITH: NO OBJECTION FOR MR. BALWANI.	
02:08PM	11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. TIME IS EXCLUDED, AND WE'LL	
02:08PM	12	SEE EVERYONE BACK ON THAT DATE.	
02:08PM	13	ANYTHING FURTHER BEFORE WE END TODAY?	
02:08PM	14	MR. COOPERSMITH: ONE QUICK THING, YOUR HONOR.	
02:08PM	15	THE COURT: YES.	
02:08PM	16	MR. COOPERSMITH: UNTIL THE JUNE 10TH MOTION IS	
02:08PM	17	HEARD AND THE COURT RULES ON THAT, THERE'S NO STAY IN EFFECT?	
02:08PM	18	THE COURT: YES, THAT'S CORRECT. THANK YOU VERY	
02:08PM	19	MUCH. WE'LL SEE YOU SOON.	
	20	(COURT CONCLUDED AT 2:08 P.M.)	
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074 DATED: APRIL 25, 2019 

## **EXHIBIT B**

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION			
4				
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR-18-00258-EJD & ) CV-18-01603-EJD			
6	PLAINTIFF, ) )			
7	VS. ) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA )			
8	ELIZABETH A. HOLMES AND RAMESH ) JUNE 28, 2019 SUNNY BALWANI, )			
9	) PAGES 1 - 71 DEFENDANTS. )			
10				
11	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ) COMMISSION, )			
12	PLAINTIFF, )			
13	VS. )			
14	RAMESH SUNNY BALWANI, )			
15	DEFENDANT. )			
16				
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA			
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE			
19	APPEARANCES:			
20	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: JOHN BOSTIC			
21	ROBERT LEACH  JEFFREY SCHENK  150 ALMADEN DOLLENADD GLITTE 000			
22	150 ALMADEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 900 SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113			
23	(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.) OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:			
24	IRENE L. RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074			
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER			

1		
2	<u>APPEARANCES:</u>	(CONT'D)
3	FOR DEFENDANT HOLMES:	WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP BY: KEVIN M. DOWNEY
4		LANCE WADE
5		725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
6		LAW OFFICE OF JOHN D. CLINE BY: JOHN D. CLINE
7		ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 500 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
8	FOR DEFENDANT RAIWANI.	DAVIS, WRIGHT & TREMAINE LLP
9	FOR DEFENDANT DALWANT.	BY: STEPHEN CAZARES 505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
10		SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
11		CORR CRONIN LLP BY: STEVEN FOGG
12		1001 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 3900 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98154
13	FOR THE S.E.C.:	
14		COMMISSION BY: SUSAN F. LAMARCA
15		MARC D. KATZ 44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2600
16		SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	JUNE 28, 2019	
	2	PROCEED:	I N G S	
10:05AM	3	(COURT CONVENED AT 10:05 A.M.)		
10:05AM	4	(COURT CONVENED AT 10:05 A.M.)		
10:05AM	5	THE COURT: THIS IS 18-258, UNITED STATES VERSUS		
10:05AM	6	ELIZABETH HOLMES AND UNITED STATES VERSUS RAMESH SUNNY BALWANI.		
10:05AM	7	THERE'S A COMPANION CASE 18-160	O3 WHICH IS THE S.E.C. CASE,	
10:06AM	8	AND WE'LL TURN TO THAT IN JUST A MOI	MENT.	
10:06AM	9	MAY I HAVE THE APPEARANCES, PLEASE.		
10:06AM	10	MR. BOSTIC: GOOD MORNING	, YOUR HONOR. JOHN BOSTIC,	
10:06AM	11	JEFF SCHENK, AND BOB LEACH FOR THE (	JNITED STATES.	
10:06AM	12	THE COURT: THANK YOU. G	OOD MORNING.	
10:06AM	13	MR. DOWNEY: GOOD MORNING	, YOUR HONOR. KEVIN DOWNEY	
10:06AM	14	FROM WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY FOR MS. HOLMES AND WITH ME ARE		
10:06AM	15	PARTNER, LANCE WADE, AND OUR CO-COUNSEL, JOHN CLINE.		
10:06AM	16	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.		
10:06AM	17	MR. CAZARES: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.		
10:06AM	18	STEPHEN CAZARES FOR MR. BALWANI. WITH ME IS MR. STEVEN FOGG		
10:06AM	19	WHO ALSO REPRESENTS MR. BALWANI.		
10:06AM	20	THE COURT: THANK YOU. G	COOD MORNING.	
10:06AM	21	LET ME JUST THANK COUNSEL FOR -	WE DID RESCHEDULE THIS TO	
10:06AM	22	THIS MORNING FROM I ADVANCED IT 1	FROM MONDAY, AND LET ME	
10:06AM	23	THANK YOU FOR THAT COURTESY.		
10:06AM	24	WELL, TODAY WE HAVE A MOTION TO COMPEL REGARDING DISCOVERY		
10:06AM	25	MATTERS. WE HAD SOME DISCUSSIONS AN	BOUT DISCOVERY WHEN WE WERE	

1 10:06AM 2 10:06AM 3 10:06AM 10:07AM 4 10:07AM 10:07AM 10:07AM 7 10:07AM 8 10:07AM 9 10:07AM 10 10:07AM 11 10:07AM 12 10:07AM 13 10:07AM 14 10:07AM 15 10:07AM 16 10:07AM 17 10:07AM 18 10:08AM 19 10:08AM 20 10:08AM 21 10:08AM 22 10:08AM 23 10:08AM 24 10:08AM 25

LAST IN COURT AND THERE WAS SOME REPRESENTATIONS MADE.

I SUPPOSE -- LET ME INDICATE WHAT I HAVE REVIEWED HERE. I
HAVE REVIEWED YOUR PLEADINGS IN THIS CASE WHICH INCLUDE

DOCUMENT 67, WHICH IS THE MOTION TO COMPEL; DOCUMENT 79, WHICH
IS THE GOVERNMENT'S OPPOSITION; DOCUMENT 81, WHICH IS THE
REPLY, DEFENSE REPLY, AND ALL OF THE ATTACHMENTS THERETO;

DOCUMENT 82 IS MR. BALWANI'S REPLY; DOCUMENT 81-1 IS THE

DECLARATION OF MR. WADE IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF THE MOTION TO

COMPEL.

I'VE LOOKED ALSO AT THE JOINDER FILED BY MR. BALWANI AND THAT WAS DOCUMENT 68; AND DOCUMENT 88, FINALLY, IS THE JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT; AND DOCUMENT 80 IS THE JOINT STATEMENT.

HAVE I LEFT ANYTHING OUT THAT EITHER PARTY WANTS TO DRAW MY ATTENTION TO?

MR. BOSTIC: NO, YOUR HONOR, NOT FOR THE GOVERNMENT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WELL, WHY DON'T I GET AN UPDATE, IF I MAY AS TO -- PARDON

ME. BEFORE WE DO THAT, I DO WANT TO DO ONE THING. I'D LIKE TO

SET THE CASE FOR TRIAL. SO WHY DON'T WE GET OUR CALENDARS OUT

AND LET'S LOOK AND SEE WHAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR THAT.

I DID READ IN YOUR STATEMENTS THAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING SEPTEMBER OF NEXT YEAR AS A DATE FOR TRIAL. I APPRECIATE THAT OFFER.

I'M GOING TO SUGGEST SOMETHING DIFFERENT. THE THOUGHT 1 10:08AM 2 OCCURS TO ME THAT THE TIME TO SECURE A JURY BEGINNING IN 10:08AM SEPTEMBER FOR THE DURATION THAT YOU'VE INDICATED, I THINK YOU 3 10:08AM 10:08AM 4 SAID 90 DAYS, 3 MONTHS, PUTS US PERILOUSLY CLOSE TO THE HOLIDAY SEASON. MY SENSE IS THAT THERE WILL BE PROBABLY SOME 10:08AM DIFFICULTY TO SECURE JURORS WHO WOULD HAVE TIME AND BE CONFLICT 10:08AM 10:08AM 7 FREE AS WE APPROACH THAT HOLIDAY SEASON. I THINK THAT'S PERHAPS NOT A GOOD PATH TO TAKE. 8 10:09AM I'M GOING TO SUGGEST SOMETHING ELSE. I UNDERSTAND THAT 10:09AM 9 10:09AM 10 YOU NEED SOME TIME TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, WHAT YOU NEED TO DO. 10:09AM 11 MY THOUGHT WAS THAT WE, AND LET ME START WITH THE AMBITIOUS DATE, PERHAPS WE COULD, PERHAPS WE COULD ENGAGE JURY 10:09AM 12 10:09AM 13 SELECTION SOME TIME THE END OF JUNE AND TAKE A BREAK AFTER WE DO THAT. THAT MIGHT TAKE A COUPLE OF DAYS. WE CAN BEGIN THE 10:09AM 14 10:09AM 15 TRIAL SOME TIME, THAT IS, EVIDENCE BEGINS SOME TIME IN JULY. FOR EXAMPLE, WE COULD BEGIN THE TRIAL SOME TIME ON JULY 7TH, 10:09AM 16 10:09AM 17 JULY 14TH, AND GO FORWARD. 10:09AM 18 RESTRAIN YOUR ENTHUSIASM, PLEASE. 10:10AM 19 (LAUGHTER.) 10:10AM 20 THE COURT: LET ME ALSO SUGGEST THEN, GOING FORWARD, 10:10AM 21 WE COULD LOOK -- I'M ALSO LOOKING AT PERHAPS JULY 14TH FOR JURY 10:10AM 22 SELECTION, THE WEEK OF JULY 14TH FOR JURY SELECTION. 10:10AM 23 WE COULD TAKE THE FOLLOWING WEEK OFF, WHICH IS THE 20TH, 10:10AM 24 AND THEN PERHAPS ENGAGE EVIDENCE ON THE 28TH, 29TH, THAT WEEK. 10:10AM 25 IF THAT DOESN'T WORK, I'M GIVING YOU SO MANY OUTS HERE, WE

10:10AM	1
10:10AM	2
10:10AM	3
10:10AM	4
10:10AM	5
10:10AM	6
10:11AM	7
10:11AM	8
10:11AM	9
10:11AM	10
10:11AM	11
10:11AM	12
10:11AM	13
10:11AM	14
10:11AM	15
10:11AM	16
10:11AM	17
10:11AM	18
10:11AM	19
10:11AM	20
10:11AM	21
10:11AM	22
10:11AM	23
10:11AM	24

10:11AM 25

COULD -- I THINK THE 28TH WE COULD, AS I SAID, BEGIN JURY

SELECTION AND THEN START EVIDENCE ON THE 4TH OF AUGUST. I

THINK THAT'S -- THAT'S BASICALLY THAT LATTER IS PUSHING IT -
ADVANCING US ABOUT A MONTH, BUT I AM -- I DO HAVE SOME CONCERN

ABOUT GOING INTO THE HOLIDAY SEASON. PERHAPS YOU HAVE HOLIDAY

PLANS AS WELL.

MR. SCHENK: YOUR HONOR, FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S

PERSPECTIVE THE GOVERNMENT IS PREPARED TO TRY THE CASE AT THE

CONVENIENCE OF THE COURT.

WHEN WE WERE LAST BEFORE YOUR HONOR IN APRIL, THE

GOVERNMENT ASKED THE COURT TO SET THE MATTER FOR TRIAL THEN

RECOGNIZING THAT DISCOVERY WAS VOLUMINOUS AND THE DEFENSE WOULD

NEED A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF TIME TO PREPARE.

WE ASKED THE COURT TO SET A TRIAL DATE EVEN A YEAR FROM THAT. SO AT THAT TIME WE PROPOSED ROUGHLY APRIL OF 2020.

SINCE THEN WE HAD A MEET AND CONFER WITH THE DEFENSE AND IN PARTICULAR COUNSEL FOR MS. HOLMES DESCRIBED TO US THE AMOUNT OF WORK THAT THEY HAD LEFT TO DO TO PREPARE FOR TRIAL, AND IT WAS KIND OF WITH THAT UNDERSTANDING THAT IN ORDER TO PREPARE THEY FELT APRIL WAS REALLY TOO SOON.

SO I THINK THE COURT HAS GIVEN US ALL FINE SUGGESTIONS

FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE, AND WE WOULD LEAVE IT UP TO

THE DEFENSE TO HEAR IF ONE OF THOSE DATES IS A POINT AT WHICH

THEY WOULD BE PREPARED TO BEGIN THE TRIAL.

BUT FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE WE THINK THAT WE

10:11AM 1 WILL BE ABLE TO BEGIN AT ANY OF THOSE DATES.

10:12AM 2 I WOULD ALSO ASK, THOUGH, THAT -- AND I

I WOULD ALSO ASK, THOUGH, THAT -- AND I'M SURE THIS IS
WHAT THE COURT MEANT -- THAT THIS IS A FIRM TRIAL DATE. WE'RE
NOT GOING TO BE COMING BACK BEFORE YOUR HONOR IN APRIL OF 2020
AND SAYING WE NOW NEED SOME ADDITIONAL TIME. WE'RE GOING TO
HAVE SIGNIFICANT SUBPOENAS TO SERVE IN THE CASE, MANY CIVILIAN
WITNESSES, AND THERE'S REAL VALUE TO HAVING FIRM TRIAL DATES.
SO WHEN WE ASK WITNESSES TO CLEAR THEIR SCHEDULES AND TO BE
AVAILABLE FOR COURT, THAT IS A ONE-TIME REQUEST AND WE CAN SAY
IT WITH SOME LEVEL OF CERTAINTY, AND I APPRECIATE I'M SURE
THAT'S WHAT THE COURT MEANT WHEN IT WAS OFFERING THESE DATES.

THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU, MS. SCHENK. THAT IS
WHAT I MEAN. YOU'RE ASKING ME TO SET ASIDE THREE MONTHS OF
COURT TIME FOR THIS CASE, AND BOTH SIDES ARE ENTITLED TO THAT.

I'LL DO THAT. I'LL DO THAT.

OF COURSE, YOU KNOW THE BUSINESS OF FEDERAL COURTS. I

NEED TO DISAPPOINT OTHER COURT USERS FOR THAT TIME PERIOD. SO

I DO WANT TO SECURE FIRM TRIAL DATES THAT GIVES EVERYONE HERE A

FIRM EVENT HORIZON TO FOCUS ON SUCH THAT THERE WON'T BE ANY

CHANGES TO THAT.

COUNSEL.

MR. DOWNEY: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD SAY WE SHARE -- WE UNDERSTAND THE SITUATION, WE UNDERSTAND THE NEED TO SET A DATE GIVEN THE LENGTH OF THE TRIAL.

I WOULD SAY OF THE DATES THAT YOU HAVE SUGGESTED, WE WOULD

10:13AM	1	SUGGEST COMMENCING WITH SELECTION ON THE 28TH OF JULY.
10:13AM	2	THE COURT: EXPERIENCED DEFENSE COUNSEL ALWAYS LOOKS
10:13AM	3	TO THE LATTER DATE. NO CRITICISM INVOLVED.
10:13AM	4	WHEN I WAS PRACTICING, THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT I
10:13AM	5	OCCASIONALLY DID AS WELL.
10:13AM	6	MR. DOWNEY: NO, I UNDERSTAND. AND I ONLY WANT TO
10:13AM	7	SAY, BECAUSE THESE ISSUES ARE NOT BEFORE THE COURT TODAY, OUR
10:13AM	8	CONCERN IS NOT REALLY ABOUT THE DATE AS AN ABSTRACTION.
10:13AM	9	OUR CONCERN IS THAT THERE ARE ANY NUMBER OF ISSUES IN
10:13AM	10	TERMS OF THE GOVERNMENT'S RULE 26 COMPLIANCE THAT ARE STILL
10:13AM	11	OUTSTANDING.
10:13AM	12	WE ARE CONTINUING TO GET LARGE VOLUMES OF MATERIAL FROM
10:14AM	13	THE GOVERNMENT SO I THINK
10:14AM	14	THE COURT: WELL, THAT'S THE PROVERB, YOU ASK AND
10:14AM	15	YOU SHALL RECEIVE. IT'S NOT A PROVERB BUT SOMEONE SAID THAT
10:14AM	16	ONCE. SO, YOU KNOW, YOU ASK FOR IT, YOU GET IT, AND THEN OF
10:14AM	17	COURSE YOU HAVE TO DIGEST IT. SO I APPRECIATE THAT. THERE'S
10:14AM	18	VOLUMINOUS DISCOVERY HERE.
10:14AM	19	I THINK IF WE SET, AND THAT WAS MY THOUGHT, AND I'M SORRY
10:14AM	20	TO INTERRUPT YOU, BUT MY THOUGHT WAS THE FIRST THING WE DO IS
10:14AM	21	LET'S SET A TRIAL DATE THAT WE CAN ALL FOCUS ON AND THEN YOU
10:14AM	22	CAN ADJUST YOUR WORK SCHEDULES ACCORDINGLY, THE PRODUCTION, AND
10:14AM	23	I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT THAT IN A MOMENT.
10:14AM	24	JUST TO ADVANCE THAT CONVERSATION, I'LL PROBABLY BE
10:14AM	25	TELLING THE GOVERNMENT, YOU NEED TO TELL THESE FOLKS TO RAMP IT

10:14AM	1	UP BECAUSE WE NOW HAVE A TRIAL DATE.
10:14AM	2	MR. DOWNEY: YEAH. AND I EXPECT, YOUR HONOR, THAT
10:14AM	3	WE'LL BE ABLE TO WORK WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND EITHER AGREE ON
10:14AM	4	OR COME CLOSE TO AGREEING ON A PROPOSED SCHEDULE THAT CONFORMS
10:14AM	5	WITH THE TRIAL DATE.
10:14AM	6	AND I WOULD SAY WE'LL LIKELY BE ASKING THE COURT TO BE
10:14AM	7	ATTENTIVE TO THAT RULE 16 CUTOFF.
10:14AM	8	THE COURT: SURE. OKAY.
10:14AM	9	MR. DOWNEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:15AM	10	THE COURT: LET ME ASK YOUR COLLEAGUES.
10:15AM	11	MR. CAZARES: YOUR HONOR, MR. BALWANI AGREES WITH
10:15AM	12	MR. DOWNEY THAT AUGUST IS LIKELY BETTER, LESS FOR OUR SCHEDULE,
10:15AM	13	BUT ALSO I'VE TRIED CASES IN THE SUMMER TIME AND JURORS ALSO
10:15AM	14	HAVE VACATION PLANS. JULY TENDS TO BE VERY DIFFICULT TO SECURE
10:15AM	15	A LONG-TERM VOIR DIRE IN FEDERAL COURT.
10:15AM	16	SO I WOULD CONCUR THAT AUGUST MAKES SENSE. IF WE START ON
10:15AM	17	THE 28TH, THAT WOULD AT LEAST AVOID SOME OF THE JUROR VACATION
10:15AM	18	ISSUES THAT OFTEN COME UP.
10:15AM	19	THE COURT: I'M SORRY. WHEN YOU SAY, "START," ARE
10:15AM	20	YOU SUGGESTING START EVIDENCE OR START THE JURY SELECTION?
10:15AM	21	MR. CAZARES: I THINK TO THE EXTENT THAT WE START
10:15AM	22	THE JURY SELECTION AT THE END OF JULY, I DON'T THINK I THINK
10:15AM	23	THAT WOULD LIKELY AVOID MOST JUROR VACATION ISSUES. I THINK
10:15AM	24	THAT'S THE GOAL IN SOME WAYS, TRY TO AVOID THEIR HOLIDAY
10:15AM	25	VACATIONS AND TRY TO AVOID MAYBE SOME OF THEIR SUMMER VACATIONS

10:15AM	1	AND PLANT THE TRIAL SOMEWHERE RIGHT IN BETWEEN.
10:15AM	2	THE COURT: MS. SCHENK?
10:15AM	3	MR. SCHENK: THAT IS FINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT. AS I
10:15AM	4	UNDERSTAND IT JULY 28TH IS JURY SELECTION?
10:15AM	5	THE COURT: RIGHT, THAT IS THE DATE THAT I WAS
10:16AM	6	PROPOSING JULY 28TH. MY SENSE IS THAT WE'LL PROBABLY BLEED
10:16AM	7	INTO THE 29TH.
10:16AM	8	BUT WE'LL DO JURY SELECTION THAT WEEK. THERE WON'T BE ANY
10:16AM	9	RECEIPT OF EVIDENCE OR OPENING STATEMENTS UNTIL THE FOLLOWING
10:16AM	10	WEEK.
10:16AM	11	EVIDENCE AND OPENING STATEMENTS WILL BEGIN AUGUST 4TH,
10:16AM	12	AUGUST 4TH.
10:16AM	13	IS THAT AGREEABLE?
10:16AM	14	MR. SCHENK: YES.
10:16AM	15	MR. DOWNEY: YES, YOUR HONOR.
10:16AM	16	MR. CAZARES: YES, YOUR HONOR.
10:16AM	17	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. THEN WE'VE GOT
10:16AM	18	OUR TRIAL DATE SET.
10:16AM	19	I WON'T SET A PRETRIAL CONFERENCE DATE YET. WHAT I'D LIKE
10:16AM	20	TO DO IS HAVE OUR CONVERSATION ABOUT DISCOVERY, AND THEN IF I
10:16AM	21	SET AN INTERIM STATUS DATE, AT WHICH POINT I'LL THEN SET AN
10:16AM	22	INTERIM STATUS CONFERENCE DATE DEPENDING ON THE DISCOVERY AS
10:16AM	23	YOU SUGGESTED.
10:16AM	24	OKAY. MADAM CLERK, LET'S RESERVE THAT TIME FOR TRIAL IN
10:16AM	25	THIS MATTER. I THINK COUNSEL SAID THREE MONTHS?

11:34AM	1	RESOLVE ANY DISPUTES THAT WE MAY HAVE.
11:34AM	2	THE COURT: THAT'S HELPFUL. THANK YOU FOR THAT.
11:34AM	3	THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.
11:34AM	4	MR. BOSTIC: ARE WE TALKING ABOUT A PROPOSED
11:34AM	5	PRETRIAL CALENDAR?
11:34AM	6	MR. WADE: YES.
11:34AM	7	MR. BOSTIC: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD IDEA.
11:34AM	8	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE YOU
11:34AM	9	ADVANCING THAT. ALSO, AFTER YOU HAVE YOUR MEET AND CONFER, AND
11:35AM	10	I ANTICIPATE IT'S GOING TO BE JUST EMINENTLY SUCCESSFUL, SHOULD
11:35AM	11	YOU NEED TO ADJUST THE 17TH, THAT IS, TO MOVE IT TO TAKE IT OFF
11:35AM	12	CALENDAR BECAUSE EVERYONE IS SATISFIED, JUST LET MS. KRATZMANN
11:35AM	13	KNOW AND WE CAN MAKE ANY ADJUSTMENTS THAT WE NEED ON THAT.
11:35AM	14	THAT'S ALWAYS OPEN.
11:35AM	15	MR. WADE: OPTIMISM SPRINGS ETERNAL, YOUR HONOR.
11:35AM	16	THE COURT: IT DOES. IT DOES. EVEN BOSTON WINS A
11:35AM	17	WORLD SERIES NOW AND THEN. ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN. ANYTHING
11:35AM	18	FURTHER?
11:35AM	19	MR. BOSTIC: JUST ONE HOUSEKEEPING MATTER.
11:35AM	20	THE COURT: YES.
11:35AM	21	MR. BOSTIC: I BELIEVE, OF COURSE, THE PARTIES ARE
11:35AM	22	EACH CONTINUING THEIR INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEW OF DISCOVERY.
11:35AM	23	IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE TO EXCLUDE TIME THROUGH THE TRIAL DATE.
11:35AM	24	THE COURT: THANK YOU. I WAS GOING TO DO THAT. WE
11:35AM	25	HAVE A TRIAL DATE SET. IT'S THE COURT'S INTENT THEN, BASED ON

11:35AM	1	OUR DISCUSSION HERE, AND WE'RE ONLY AT DISCOVERY, BUT I WILL
11:36AM	2	EXCLUDE TIME TO ALLOW FOR EFFECTIVE PREPARATION OF COUNSEL.
11:36AM	3	TIME IS EXCLUDED TO OUR TRIAL DATE FOR BOTH DEFENDANTS IN THIS
11:36AM	4	MATTER.
11:36AM	5	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
11:36AM	6	MR. BOSTIC: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:36AM	7	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:36AM	8	MR. CAZARES: THANK YOU.
11:36AM	9	THE COURT: AND WE HAVE AN S.E.C. CASE. SHOULD WE
11:36AM	10	CALL THAT NOW BEFORE EVERYONE LEAVES?
11:36AM	11	MS. LAMARCA: SURE.
11:36AM	12	THE COURT: THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE.
11:36AM	13	MS. LAMARCA: SUSAN LAMARCA WITH THE S.E.C.
11:36AM	14	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
11:36AM	15	MR. KATZ: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. MARC KATZ FOR
11:36AM	16	THE S.E.C.
11:36AM	17	THE COURT: THANK YOU. NICE TO SEE YOU AGAIN.
11:36AM	18	MR. CAZARES: GOOD MORNING AGAIN, YOUR HONOR,
11:36AM	19	STEPHEN CAZARES FOR THE MR. BALWANI.
11:36AM	20	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING. SO WHAT
11:36AM	21	SHOULD WE DO IN THIS CASE?
11:36AM	22	MS. LAMARCA: I THINK THE ONLY MATTER THAT WE HAVE
11:36AM	23	IN OUR JOINT STATEMENT WAS THE CONFIRMATION OF DATES THAT WE
11:36AM	24	AGREED COULD BE PUSHED OUT ANOTHER I THINK IT WAS 120 DAYS THE
11:36AM	25	COURT SET FOR THE CUTOFF OF REGULAR DISCOVERY, AND WE CAN HAD

11:36AM	1	HAD A LATTER EXPERT DISCOVERY DATE AND SO WE WANTED TO MAKE
11:36AM	2	SURE THAT THE COURT WENT AHEAD AND ORDERED THAT DATE.
11:36AM	3	MR. CAZARES: THAT'S ACCEPTABLE, YOUR HONOR, YES.
11:37AM	4	MS. LAMARCA: GREAT. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:37AM	5	THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. GOOD SEEING YOU
11:37AM	6	ALL. THANK YOU.
11:37AM	7	MR. DOWNEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:37AM	8	THE CLERK: COURT IS ADJOURNED.
11:37AM	9	(COURT CONCLUDED AT 11:37 A.M.)
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074 DATED: JULY 2, 2019 

## **EXHIBIT C**

### NOTICE OF MANUAL FILING

Regarding: EXHIBIT C – Under Seal Document

This filing is in paper or physical form only, and is being maintained in the case file in the Clerk's office. If you are a participant on this case, this filing will be served in hard-copy shortly. For information on retrieving this filing directly from the court, please see the court's main web site at

<u>http://www.cand.uscourts.gov</u> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

The filing was not e-filed for the following reasons:

EXHIBIT C – Under Seal Document

### EXHIBIT D

### NOTICE OF MANUAL FILING

Regarding: EXHIBIT D – Under Seal Document

This filing is in paper or physical form only, and is being maintained in the case file in the Clerk's office. If you are a participant on this case, this filing will be served in hard-copy shortly. For information on retrieving this filing directly from the court, please see the court's main web site at

<u>http://www.cand.uscourts.gov</u> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

The filing was not e-filed for the following reasons:

EXHIBIT D – Under Seal Document

# **EXHIBIT E**

1	
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	SAN JOSE DIVISION
	SAN JOSE DIVISION
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR-18-00258-EJD
6	PLAINTIFF, )
7	) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA VS.
8	) APRIL 15, 2020 ELIZABETH A. HOLMES,
9	) PAGES 1 - 34 DEFENDANT. )
10	)
11	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	APPEARANCES (TELEPHONICALLY):
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: JOHN C. BOSTIC
17	JEFFREY B. SCHENK 150 ALMADEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113
18	BY: ROBERT S. LEACH
19	VANESSA BAEHR-JONES 1301 CLAY STREET, SUITE 340S
20	OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
21	(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)
22	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:
23	IRENE L. RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074
24	
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER

1	
2	APPEARANCES (TELEPHONICALLY): (CONT'D)
3	FOR DEFENDANT HOLMES: WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP BY: KEVIN M. DOWNEY
4	LANCE A. WADE 725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.
5	WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
6	LAW OFFICE OF JOHN D. CLINE BY: JOHN D. CLINE
7	ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 500 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

APRIL 15, 2020 1 SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA PROCEEDINGS 2 (COURT CONVENED AT 10:17 A.M.) 3 10:17AM 10:17AM 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 10:17AM 5 WELL, LET'S CALL THE CASE OF 18-258, THIS IS UNITED STATES 10:17AM 6 OF AMERICA VERSUS ELIZABETH HOLMES. LET ME STATE AT THE OUTSET 10:17AM 7 THAT WE ARE CONDUCTING THIS HEARING BY WAY OF TELEPHONIC HEARING. 10:17AM 8 THE COURT REFERS THE PARTIES TO GENERAL ORDER 74 FROM OUR 10:17AM 9 10:18AM 10 CHIEF JUDGE PHYLLIS HAMILTON, AND WE RECOGNIZE BECAUSE OF THE 10:18AM 11 CURRENT COVID-19 CRISIS, HEARINGS CURRENTLY CANNOT BE CONDUCTED 10:18AM 12 IN PERSON WITHOUT SERIOUSLY JEOPARDIZING PUBLIC HEALTH AND 10:18AM 13 SAFETY. THE SAN JOSE COURTHOUSE WHERE THIS CASE IS VENUED IS 10:18AM 14 10:18AM 15 CLOSED AND WILL BE CLOSED CURRENTLY TO MAY 1, AND THAT IS SUBJECT TO REVIEW, OF COURSE. BUT THE COURTHOUSE IS CURRENTLY 10:18AM 16 10:18AM 17 CLOSED, AND WE ARE CONDUCTING THIS HEARING OTHERWISE 10:18AM 18 TELEPHONICALLY. 10:18AM 19 I'M GOING TO CALL FOR THE APPEARANCES OF THE PARTIES IN JUST A MOMENT. BUT LET ME ASK, WE ARE ON A TELEPHONIC HEARING. 10:18AM 20 I'M GOING TO ASK ALL PARTIES WHO ARE NOT SPEAKING TO PLEASE 10:18AM 21 10:18AM 22 MUTE YOUR PHONES, PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES, AND YOU CAN UNMUTE 10:18AM 23 THEM, OF COURSE, WHEN YOU'RE CALLED UPON TO SPEAK OR WHEN YOU 10:18AM 24 ARE SPEAKING, BUT I WOULD OTHERWISE APPRECIATE THAT. 10:19AM 25 LET'S START THEN WITH THE GOVERNMENT. IF I COULD CAPTURE

10:19AM	1	THE APPEARANCES FOR THE GOVERNMENT, PLEASE.
10:19AM	2	MR. LEACH: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
10:19AM	3	THIS IS ROBERT LEACH ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES AND
10:19AM	4	ALSO ON THE LINE ARE MY COLLEAGUES JEFF SCHENK, JOHN BOSTIC,
10:19AM	5	AND VANESSA BAEHR-JONES.
10:19AM	6	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
10:19AM	7	LET ME TURN TO THE DEFENSE.
10:19AM	8	MR. WADE: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
10:19AM	9	IT'S LANCE WADE ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLMES. WITH ME THIS
10:19AM	10	MORNING ARE KEVIN DOWNEY AND JOHN CLINE.
10:19AM	11	MS. HOLMES IS ALSO PRESENT ON THE LINE.
10:19AM	12	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MS. HOLMES, ARE YOU THERE?
10:19AM	13	THE DEFENDANT: YES. GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
10:19AM	14	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
10:19AM	15	AND, MR. WADE, DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT VOICE AS THAT OF YOUR
10:19AM	16	CLIENT?
10:19AM	17	MR. WADE: I DO, YOUR HONOR.
10:20AM	18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:20AM	19	LET ME ALSO ADD A CAVEAT HERE, MR. WADE. I DON'T KNOW IF
10:20AM	20	YOU HAVE ENGAGED PROTOCOLS SUCH THAT DURING THIS PROCEEDING IF
10:20AM	21	YOUR CLIENT WISHES TO SPEAK WITH YOU PRIVATELY, SHE MAY DO
10:20AM	22	THAT. I NEGLECTED TO MENTION THAT AT OUR LAST HEARING, BUT I
10:20AM	23	WANT TO ENSURE THAT MS. HOLMES HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK
10:20AM	24	WITH HER DEFENSE COUNSEL DURING THESE PROCEEDINGS.
10:20AM	25	MY SENSE IS THAT SHE IS NOT SITTING NEXT TO YOU OR DOESN'T

10:20AM	1	HAVE PROXIMITY NEXT TO YOU PHYSICALLY OR YOUR DEFENSE TEAM.
10:20AM	2	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THAT IS CORRECT.
10:20AM	3	WE ARE NOT NONE OF US ARE IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO ONE ANOTHER.
10:20AM	4	I APPRECIATE THE COMMENTS OF THE COURT.
10:20AM	5	AS THE COURT KNOWS, MS. HOLMES'S APPEARANCE WAS WAIVED IN
10:20AM	6	THE PRIOR HEARING SO I DON'T BELIVE THAT WAS AN ISSUE NECESSARY
10:20AM	7	TO ADDRESS THEN.
10:21AM	8	FOR PURPOSES OF THIS HEARING, IF WE FIND A TIME WHERE WE
10:21AM	9	BELIEVE WE NEED TO COMMUNICATE WITH HER SEPARATELY, WE'LL NOTE
10:21AM	10	THAT FOR THE COURT AND MAYBE SEEK THE COURT'S INDULGENCE
10:21AM	11	BRIEFLY SO WE CAN DO THAT VIA A SEPARATE LINE OF COMMUNICATION.
10:21AM	12	BUT MY HOPE IS THAT WON'T BE NECESSARY THIS MORNING.
10:21AM	13	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
10:21AM	14	BUT I DO WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT I, OF COURSE, WILL AVAIL
10:21AM	15	MYSELF AND YOU OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOUR CLIENT.
10:21AM	16	WE'LL DO WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO ACCOMPLISH THAT. I KNOW YOU
10:21AM	17	HAVE OTHER COUNSEL THERE. PERHAPS I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY
10:21AM	18	PHONES MS. HOLMES HAS, BUT PERHAPS YOU CAN TEXT ONE ANOTHER OR
10:21AM	19	SOMETHING.
10:21AM	20	IF YOU NEED TO TAKE A BREAK, JUST LET ME KNOW, AND WE'LL
10:21AM	21	OF COURSE STOP THE PROCEEDINGS AND ALLOW YOU TO CONFER
10:21AM	22	PRIVATELY OFF THE RECORD WITH YOUR CLIENT.
10:21AM	23	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:21AM	24	THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. ALL RIGHT.
10:21AM	25	LET ME ANYTHING FURTHER? ANYTHING ANYONE WISHES TO SAY

10:21AM	1	BEFORE WE PROCEED?
10:21AM	2	ANYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT?
10:21AM	3	ANYTHING FROM, MR. WADE, YOUR TEAM?
10:22AM	4	MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS ROBERT LEACH
10:22AM	5	FOR THE UNITED STATES. THANK YOU. NOTHING FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
10:22AM	6	MR. WADE: THIS IS LANCE WADE, YOUR HONOR. NOTHING
10:22AM	7	FROM US.
10:22AM	8	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
10:22AM	9	LET ME THANK YOU FOR FILING DOCUMENT 372, WHICH IS YOUR
10:22AM	10	JOINT STATUS MEMORANDUM, AND I APPRECIATE YOUR DILIGENCE IN
10:22AM	11	WORKING TOGETHER AND GETTING THAT FILED IN THE SHORT NOTICE
10:22AM	12	THAT THE COURT GAVE YOU. IT'S VERY HELPFUL.
10:22AM	13	WE HAVE OF COURSE, WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO THE TRIAL
10:22AM	14	OF THIS MATTER, AND WE'RE DOING THIS UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF THE
10:22AM	15	CURRENT COVID PROCESS THAT CONTINUES TO POSSESS THE NATION, AND
10:22AM	16	WE'RE TRYING OUR BEST TO ACCOMMODATE ALL MATTERS IN OUR COURTS
10:22AM	17	WITH AN EYE TOWARD MAKING SURE THAT BOTH SIDES, EVERYONE HAS
10:22AM	18	FAIR ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND A FAIR HEARING IN THE COURTS.
10:22AM	19	I HAVE YOUR SCHEDULES HERE, AND I APPRECIATE OFFERING THE
10:22AM	20	SCHEDULES. I THINK WHAT REALLY WE NEED TO LOOK AT, AND I ENDED
10:23AM	21	OUR LAST CONVERSATION WITH THIS, WHAT IS THE REALISTIC SCHEDULE
10:23AM	22	FOR A TRIAL IN THIS MATTER?
10:23AM	23	I APPRECIATE BOTH SIDE'S EFFORTS TO AT LEAST PRESS FORWARD
10:23AM	24	TO SEE IF WE CAN HAVE THE CASE PRESENTED TO A JURY THIS YEAR.
10:23AM	25	AND AS I LOOK AT YOUR DOCUMENTS, YOU SUGGEST THAT BOTH SIDES

1 10:23AM 10:23AM 3 10:23AM 10:23AM 4 10:23AM 10:23AM 6 10:23AM 7 10:23AM 8 10:24AM 9 10:24AM 10 10:24AM 11 10:24AM 12 10:24AM 13 10:24AM 14 10:24AM 15 10:24AM 16 10:24AM 17 10:24AM 18 10:24AM 19 10:24AM 20 10:25AM 21 10:25AM 22 10:25AM 23 10:25AM 24

10:25AM 25

SUGGEST OCTOBER TRIAL DATES.

MS. HOLMES, THE DEFENSE SUGGESTS AN OCTOBER 26TH DATE.

THE GOVERNMENT DATE IS, PROPOSED DATE IS ABOUT 20 DAYS BEFORE

THAT, OCTOBER 6TH.

I ALSO APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT YOU RECOGNIZE THAT WE SHOULD HAVE AN INTERIM STATUS HEARING, WHICH I THINK IS WISE. YOU SUGGEST A DATE IN JULY FOR THAT. I THINK ALL OF THAT IS APPROPRIATE.

NOW, I DO NOTE IN THE DOCUMENT IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY SEEK, MAY SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT FROM THE GRAND JURY. AS NOTED, THE GRAND JURY IS IN SUSPENSION RIGHT NOW AND THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO PROCEED BECAUSE OF THE CLOSURE OF OUR COURTHOUSE UNTIL MAY 1ST. AND SO THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN. THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN WHETHER OR NOT A GRAND JURY WOULD INDEED ISSUE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT. I THINK MR. WADE NOTES THAT IN HIS PLEADINGS AS WELL.

SO I WANTED TO ASK BOTH SIDES, PLEASE, TO COMMENT ON THE OCTOBER TRIAL DATE AS IT'S SET AND THE REALITIES OF THAT GIVEN THE FACT THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY SUPERSEDE, AS WELL AS LOOKING FORWARD INTO 2021 FOR A TRIAL DATE IN EARLY 2021. I KNOW THE DEFENSE SUGGESTS THAT THAT IS A MORE REALISTIC DATE GIVEN NOT JUST THE COVID SITUATION BUT THE FACT THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT FILED.

MR. LEACH, YOUR TEAM WAS VERY THOROUGH IN YOUR SIDE OF
THE -- YOUR PORTION OF DOCUMENT 372, THE JOINT MEMORANDA, BUT I

10:25AM	1	DID WANT TO GIVE YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK FURTHER ON THAT.
10:25AM	2	SO WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THIS?
10:25AM	3	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I APPRECIATE
10:25AM	4	THAT. THIS IS ROBERT LEACH.
10:25AM	5	WE BELIEVE AN OCTOBER DATE IS REALISTIC REGARDLESS OF
10:25AM	6	WHETHER THE CURRENT CHARGING INSTRUMENT IS SUPERSEDED.
10:25AM	7	I WOULD NOTE THAT IT'S APRIL 15TH. WE ARE
10:25AM	8	THE COURT: YOU KNOW, LET'S MR. LEACH, WE'VE
10:26AM	9	PAUSED FOR A MOMENT BECAUSE THE AT&T LINE THAT WE HAVE,
10:26AM	10	REGRETTABLY, IT DOES INDICATE WHEN PEOPLE SIGN ON AND OFF, AND
10:26AM	11	WE'RE TREATED TO A LOVELY LULLABY OF BEATS.
10:26AM	12	WE'RE TRYING TO LOOK AT OTHER TECHNOLOGY THAT PERMITS US
10:26AM	13	TO ELIMINATE THAT, BUT REGRETTABLY, WE DON'T HAVE IT IN PLACE
10:26AM	14	FOR THIS HEARING. I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT.
10:26AM	15	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:26AM	16	I AM GOING TO CHOOSE TO HOPE THAT PEOPLE WERE JOINING THE
10:26AM	17	LINE RATHER THAN LEAVING THE LINE WHEN I WAS SPEAKING.
10:26AM	18	AS I WAS SAYING, IT'S APRIL 15TH TODAY. WE ARE SIX MONTHS
10:26AM	19	AWAY FROM OCTOBER. I DON'T THINK IT'S UNUSUAL FOR THE
10:26AM	20	GOVERNMENT TO SUPERSEDE A CHARGING INSTRUMENT, AND, OF COURSE,
10:26AM	21	THAT'S A DECISION THAT IS RESERVED FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
10:26AM	22	IN MOST CASES WHEN THE GOVERNMENT DOES THAT, THE FIRST
10:27AM	23	TIME THAT THE DEFENSE LEARNS ABOUT IT IS WHEN THE GRAND JURY
10:27AM	24	ELECTS TO RETURN THE INDICTMENT.
10:27AM	25	GIVEN THE COVID SITUATION, WE WANTED TO AVOID THAT, WHICH

10:27AM	1
10:27AM	2
10:27AM	3
10:27AM	4
10:27AM	5
10:27AM	6
10:27AM	7
10:27AM	8
10:27AM	9
10:27AM	10
10:27AM	11
10:27AM	12
10:28AM	13
10:28AM	14
10:28AM	15
10:28AM	16
10:28AM	17
10:28AM	18
10:28AM	19
10:28AM	20
10:28AM	21
10:28AM	22
10:28AM	23
10:28AM	24
10:28AM	25

IS WHY WE PROPOSED PROCEEDING BY SUPERSEDING INFORMATION AND PROVIDING THE DRAFT SUPERSEDING INFORMATION TO THE DEFENSE SO THE DEFENSE HAD AT LEAST THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE OF WHAT IT INTENDED TO DO.

I WOULD NOTE THAT THE DEFENDANTS MOVED TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENTS IN DECEMBER OF 2019. THEY COULD HAVE MOVED TO DO THAT EARLIER AND ELECTED NOT TO DO THAT.

THE COURT RULED ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS IN LATE FEBRUARY,

AND I DON'T THINK IT IS UNREASONABLE OR CAN COME AS A SURPRISE

TO ANYBODY THAT THE GOVERNMENT MIGHT REACT TO THE DISMISSAL OF

CERTAIN COUNTS.

SO I THINK THAT ADDRESSES A LITTLE BIT OF WHY I DON'T THINK ANY SUPERSEDING INSTRUMENT SHOULD COME AS A SURPRISE.

I ALSO THINK IT'S A BIT OF AN OVERSTATEMENT TO SAY THAT
THE PROPOSED CHANGES THE GOVERNMENT IS PURSUING REALLY CHANGE
THE TRIAL IN THIS CASE OR REALLY CHANGE THE PERSPECTIVE ON THE
CASE.

I DO NOT ANTICIPATE ANY NEW SUBSTANTIAL DISCOVERY. I
THINK WHATEVER DISCOVERY THE GOVERNMENT PRODUCED, I THINK WE
HAVE ALREADY PRODUCED THE VAST BULK OF IT AND THE REMAINDER
WOULD BE QUITE NEGLIGIBLE.

I KNOW IN THE STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT THE DEFENSE

MENTIONS WALGREENS. WALGREENS HAS BEEN IN THE INDICTMENT SINCE

DAY ONE. THEY MENTION SAFEWAY AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO

SAFEWAY HAVE BEEN IN DISCOVERY SINCE THE GOVERNMENT'S INITIAL

1 10:28AM 2 10:29AM 3 10:29AM 10:29AM 4 10:29AM 10:29AM 10:29AM 8 10:29AM 10:29AM 9 10:29AM 10 10:29AM 11 10:29AM 12 10:29AM 13 10:29AM 14 10:30AM 15 10:30AM 16 10:30AM 17 10:30AM 18 10:30AM 19 10:30AM 20 10:30AM 21 10:30AM 22 10:30AM 23 10:30AM 24 10:30AM 25

PRODUCTION. THEY MENTIONED THE ADDITIONAL BOARD MEMBERS AS INVESTORS, AND THAT ALSO HAS BEEN IN DISCOVERY SINCE THE INITIAL PRODUCTION.

I WOULD NOTE THAT MANY OF THE MATTERS THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS PURSUING WAS IN OUR RULE 404(B) NOTICE, WHICH WE'VE BEEN PROVIDING SINCE THE OUTSET BUT SUMMARIZED ON MARCH 6TH, 2020.

SO WE WANT THE DEFENSE TO BE PREPARED. WE DON'T WANT THE DATE TO MOVE. I JUST DON'T THINK CHANGES IN THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT ARE ANY IMPEDIMENTS TO PROCEEDING IN OCTOBER.

AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO HIGHLIGHT THE CHANGES THAT
THE GOVERNMENT PROVIDED TO MS. HOLMES. I THINK IT'S LIMITED TO
EIGHT PARAGRAPHS OF THE INDICTMENT. WE ADD A SINGLE LINE IN
PARAGRAPH 3 THAT SAYS "THERANOS INVESTORS INCLUDED INDIVIDUALS,
ENTITIES, CERTAIN BUSINESS PARTNERS, MEMBERS OF ITS BOARD OF
DIRECTORS, AND INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES WHO INVESTED THROUGH
FIRMS FORMED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE PURPOSE OR PRIMARY PURPOSE OF
INVESTING IN THERANOS'S SECURITIES."

WE THINK THESE WERE INVESTORS WHO WERE ALREADY IN THE CASE

AND THAT THIS DOES NOT SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGE THE DYNAMIC OF A

TRIAL.

THE OTHER CHANGES ARE TO PARAGRAPHS 10, 11, AND 12, AND IT SIMPLY IS CHANGING A DATE FROM 2010 TO 2013.

WE AMEND PARAGRAPH 16 TO MAKE A FURTHER ALLEGATION AND TO IDENTIFY CERTAIN BLOOD TESTS THAT ARE SPELLED OUT IN THE BILL OF PARTICULARS.

AND WE CHANGE TWO WIRE FRAUD COUNTS IN PARAGRAPHS 18 AND 1 10:30AM 26 FROM PATIENTS 1 AND 2 TO BB AND ET. 2 10:30AM THAT'S THE EXTENT OF THE CHANGES THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS 3 10:30AM 10:30AM 4 PURSUING, AND WE DON'T THINK IT ALTERS THE LENGTH OF THE TRIAL OR REALLY CHANGES THE DYNAMIC THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT. 10:30AM WITH RESPECT TO COVID-19, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T HAVE SPECIAL 10:30AM 6 10:31AM 7 INSIGHT INTO WHAT THE WORLD IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE IN OCTOBER. WE HEARD THE COURT'S COMMENTS AT THE LAST CONFERENCE ABOUT THE 10:31AM 8 DIFFICULTY OF SERVING SUMMONS AND LARGE GATHERINGS. WE'RE 10:31AM 9 10:31AM 10 MINDFUL OF THAT. 10:31AM 11 WE THINK OCTOBER SEEMS FAR ENOUGH REMOVED FROM THAT AND 10:31AM 12 THAT THE BETTER COURSE IS TO PLAN FOR THAT AND CHECK IN IN JULY IF WE NEED TO, BUT PLANNING FOR 2021 JUST SEEMS LIKE WE'RE 10:31AM 13 PLANNING FOR FAILURE, AND I THINK THE BETTER COURSE IS TO SET 10:31AM 14 10:31AM 15 THE DATE, WORK TOWARDS THAT, AND IF AGAINST ALL OF OUR HOPES THE WORLD IS NOT IN A DIFFERENT SITUATION IN OCTOBER, WE CAN 10:31AM 16 10:31AM 17 REACT TO THAT. 10:31AM 18 BUT SETTING THE DATE OUT IN '21 JUST CREATES TOO MUCH 10:31AM 19 UNCERTAINTY AND IS REALLY PLANNING FOR FAILURE. 10:31AM 20 SO FOR THESE REASONS WE THINK OCTOBER IS REASONABLE, AND WE THINK THE COURT SHOULD ORDER THAT DATE. 10:32AM 21 10:32AM 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 10:32AM 23 LET ME ASK IN REGARDS TO THE POTENTIAL SUPERSEDING 10:32AM 24 DOCUMENT, IF THE GRAND JURY DOES RETURN THE COUNTS AND THE 10:32AM 25 CHANGES THAT YOU'RE SEEKING, DO YOU HAVE A THOUGHT AS TO AN

10:32AM	1	INCREASE IN WITNESSES, PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, ET CETERA, HOW
10:32AM	2	THAT MIGHT AFFECT THINGS?
10:32AM	3	MR. LEACH: IT CERTAINLY DOES NOT CHANGE FROM THE
10:32AM	4	GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE WHO WE WERE INTENDING TO CALL IN THE
10:32AM	5	TRIAL. I THINK THE TRIAL STAYS THE SAME LENGTH.
10:32AM	6	I THINK THERE ARE GOING TO BE WALGREENS, SAFEWAY AND BOARD
10:32AM	7	OF DIRECTORS WITNESSES IN THIS TRIAL REGARDLESS, SO I DON'T
10:32AM	8	THINK IT CHANGED THE WITNESSES.
10:32AM	9	AND AS I ALLUDED TO EARLIER, YOUR HONOR, WITH THE
10:32AM	10	EXCEPTION OF POSSIBLY 302'S OR WITNESS STATEMENTS, I DO NOT
10:33AM	11	ANTICIPATE ANY SUBSTANTIAL DISCOVERY, CERTAINLY NOTHING
10:33AM	12	COMPARED TO THE 20 MILLION-PLUS DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE ALREADY
10:33AM	13	BEEN PRODUCED IN THIS CASE. I THINK ANY REMAINING DISCOVERY
10:33AM	14	WOULD BE VERY, VERY NEGLIGIBLE.
10:33AM	15	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANYTHING
10:33AM	16	FURTHER THEN?
10:33AM	17	MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
10:33AM	18	THE COURT: OKAY. MR. WADE.
10:33AM	19	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS
10:33AM	20	LANCE WADE ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLMES.
10:33AM	21	I WILL START WHERE THE COURT HAS AND AS THE COURT DIRECTED
10:33AM	22	IN THE PRIOR HEARING WITH THE CURRENT HEALTH DIRECTIVES AND
10:33AM	23	SOME OF OUR THINKING ON THAT AS THE COURT MADE THAT INQUIRY.
10:33AM	24	AND WE, OF COURSE, THANK THE COURT FOR ITS CARE AND CONCERN
10:33AM	25	ABOUT THESE ISSUES AND OF COURSE ITS THE DESIRE TO KEEP ALL

10:33AM	1
10:33AM	2
10:34AM	3
10:34AM	4
10:34AM	5
10:34AM	6
10:34AM	7
10:34AM	8
10:34AM	9
10:34AM	10
10:34AM	11
10:34AM	12
10:34AM	13
10:34AM	14
10:34AM	15
10:34AM	16
10:35AM	17
10:35AM	18
10:35AM	19
10:35AM	20
10:35AM	21
10:35AM	22
10:35AM	23
10:35AM	24
10:35AM	25

TRIAL PARTICIPANTS SAFE THROUGH THIS ENTIRE PROCESS.

WE'RE OBVIOUSLY IN UNCHARTERED TERRITORY HERE, YOUR HONOR,
BOTH IN OUR DAILY LIVES AND IN OUR CURRENT OCCUPATIONS AND THIS
HEARING.

I THINK NONE OF US, INCLUDING SOME OF THE LEADING PUBLIC HEALTH EXPERTS, REALLY KNOW WITH ANY DEGREE OF CERTAINTY WHAT THE SECOND HALF OF THIS YEAR WILL LOOK LIKE FROM A HEALTH PERSPECTIVE.

NO ONE HAS A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT CONDUCT WILL BE DEEMED SAFE DURING THAT TIME PERIOD OR WHAT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL DISTANCING GUIDANCE MAY BE NEEDED.

BY EXTENSION, OF COURSE, IT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR
US, AND I'M SURE FOR THE COURT, TO KNOW WHETHER THOSE
CONDITIONS WILL BE CONDUCIVE TO A LENGTHY JURY TRIAL SUCH AS
THE ONE CONTEMPLATED IN THIS MATTER.

WHILE THE PARTIES ARE, OF COURSE, YOU KNOW, IN COURT WITH GREAT FREQUENCY, THE COURT IS VASTLY MORE EXPERIENCED IN CONDUCTING ITS OWN PROCEDURES AND RECOGNIZES THE NUMBER OF CHANGES TO COURTROOM PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS THAT WILL BE NECESSARY TO TRY AND ADDRESS HEALTH RELATED ISSUES.

WE'RE CONFIDENT THAT THE COURT WILL DO THAT AND OF COURSE STAND PREPARED TO ASSIST THE COURT IN ANY WAY THAT WE CAN.

THERE'S NOTHING ABOUT THE PARTIES TO THIS CASE OR COUNSEL IN THIS CASE WITH RESPECT TO THESE HEALTH ISSUES THAT MERITS SPECIAL ATTENTION.

10:35AM	1
10:35AM	2
10:35AM	3
10:36AM	4
10:36AM	5
10:36AM	6
10:36AM	7
10:36AM	8
10:36AM	9
10:36AM	10
10:36AM	11
10:36AM	12
10:36AM	13
10:36AM	14
10:36AM	15
10:36AM	16
10:37AM	17
10:37AM	18
10:37AM	19
10:37AM	20
10:37AM	21
10:37AM	22
10:37AM	23
10:37AM	24
10:37AM	25

ALL FUTURE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THIS COURT AND OTHER
COURTS ARE GOING TO HAVE TO WRESTLE WITH THIS NEW POST-PANDEMIC
WORLD IN HEARINGS AND JURY TRIALS WHEN OTHER COURT PROCEEDINGS
RESUME. AGAIN, WE KNOW THE COURT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK TO
PRIORITIZE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF ALL OF US WHO APPEAR BEFORE
IT AS WE WORK TO ADAPT TO THAT NEW WORLD.

THERE ARE CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO THIS CASE, HOWEVER, THAT WE THINK HEIGHTEN THE HEALTH RISK.

AS THE COURT, AND THE GOVERNMENT UNDOUBTEDLY RECOGNIZED,
THERE'S A GREATER RISK OF TRIAL DISRUPTION FROM THE VIRUS IN A
TRIAL THAT OCCURS OVER THE COURSE OF 100 DAYS THAN A TRIAL THAT
OCCURS OVER THE COURSE OF 1 OR 2. THAT FLOWS FROM BASIC MATH
AND STATISTICAL PROBABILITY.

THE CROWDS THAT WILL LIKELY GATHER OUTSIDE OF THE
COURTHOUSE IN THIS CASE AND THEN FILL THE COURTROOM, AS THEY
HAVE IN NEARLY ALL PRIOR PROCEEDINGS, ADD TO THAT HEALTH RISK.

WHAT ALL PARTIES HERE IN THE COURT I AM SURE UNDOUBTEDLY
WANT IS AS SAFE AND AS SMOOTH A TRIAL AS POSSIBLE, ONE FREE
FROM DISRUPTION.

A MISTRIAL IS A REGRETTABLE EVENT IN ANY CIRCUMSTANCES,

AND IT'S OF COURSE A MASS OF CONCERN AND A BURDEN FOR ALL

INVOLVED WHEN THAT HAPPENS IN A LENGTHY TRIAL LIKE THIS.

WE CERTAINLY DON'T THINK IT'S PRUDENT TO START A TRIAL IF
THE PUBLIC HEALTH ENVIRONMENT SUGGESTS THAT THERE'S A
SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED RISK OF A MISTRIAL.

10:	37AM	1
10:	37AM	2
10:	37AM	3
10:	38AM	4
10:	38AM	5
10:	38AM	6
10:	38AM	7
10:	38AM	8
10:	38AM	9
10:	38AM	10
10:	38AM	11
10:	38AM	12
10:	38AM	13
10:	38AM	14
10:	38AM	15
10:	38AM	16
10:	38AM	17
10:	39AM	18
10:	39AM	19
10:	39AM	20
10:	39AM	21
10:	39AM	22
10:	39AM	23
10:	39AM	24
10.	ЗОДМ	25

THIS IS WHY IN OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND IN
THE PLEADING THAT WE SAID BEFORE THE COURT AT DOCKET 372, WE
ARTICULATED OUR BELIEF EVEN BEFORE THE CONCEPT OF A SUPERSEDING
INDICTMENT WAS DISCUSSED THAT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO DELAY
THE TRIAL UNTIL EARLY NEXT YEAR.

GIVEN THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAS RELUCTANT TO DO THAT, WE OF COURSE HAVE TRIED TO FIND A WAY WHERE WE CAN MAKE AN ACCOMMODATION THAT WOULD ACCOUNT FOR SOME OF THE PARTICULAR LIMITATIONS AND TRIAL PREPARATION THAT RESULTED FROM THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES.

AS THE COURT KNOWS, AND WE'VE DISCUSSED IN PRIOR CALLS,
THERE'S MUCH THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO DO AND WE PLEDGE TO THE
COURT THAT WE ARE CONTINUING TO WORK DILIGENTLY WITH ALL TASKS
THAT WE CAN DO IN OUR CURRENT REMOTE WORKING ENVIRONMENT, BUT
OF COURSE THERE ARE MANY TASKS THAT WE CAN'T DO TO PREPARE FOR
TRIAL THAT REQUIRE ACTIVITIES THAT ARE ILL-ADVISED OR ILLEGAL
GIVEN THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES AND PUBLIC HEALTH CONDITIONS.

OUR SUGGESTION INITIALLY FOR THE 90-DAY DELAY WAS DONE
WITH THE BELIEF -- TO LATE OCTOBER -- WAS DONE WITH THE BELIEF
THAT A DELAY OF THAT PERIOD WOULD HELP US ACCOUNT FOR SOME OF
THE LIMITATIONS THAT WE ARE UNDER IN THE REMOTE WORK AND
CURRENT HEALTH ENVIRONMENT. THAT'S WHY WE PROPOSED THAT
SCHEDULE.

WE RECOGNIZED WHEN WE PROPOSED THAT SCHEDULE, AND WE BELIEVE IT'S TRUE WITH ANY SCHEDULE THAT STARTS THAT LATE, THAT

1 10:39AM 2 10:39AM 3 10:39AM 10:39AM 4 10:40AM 10:40AM 10:40AM 7 8 10:40AM 10:40AM 9 10:40AM 10 10:40AM 11 10:40AM 12 10:40AM 13 10:40AM 14 10:40AM 15 10:41AM 16 10:41AM 17 10:41AM 18 10:41AM 19 10:41AM 20 10:41AM 21 10:41AM 22 10:41AM 23 10:41AM 24

10:41AM 25

THAT COULD PUSH US INTO A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE WORKING THROUGH THE HOLIDAYS.

WE, OF COURSE, IN NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES WOULDN'T CONSIDER PROPOSING SOME STEPS, BUT WE RECOGNIZE THAT WE ARE IN EXTRAORDINARY TIMES, AND WE RECOGNIZE THAT IN TIMES SUCH AS THAT SACRIFICES ARE NEEDED. AND ENSURING THAT OUR CLIENT HAS AN APPROPRIATE DEFENSE, WE'RE PREPARED TO WORK THROUGH THE HOLIDAYS AS NEEDED IF THAT'S WHAT ENDS UP HAPPENING.

NOW, OF COURSE THAT, THAT PROPOSAL CHANGED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT INFORMED US AT THIS POINT THAT IT INTENDED TO SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT.

AND WHILE I APPRECIATE THAT COUNSEL FOR THE GOVERNMENT

DOESN'T BELIEVE IT WILL SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THEIR TRIAL

PREPARATION TIME, I WILL MAKE CLEAR TO THE COURT THAT IF THE

GRAND JURY CHOOSES TO RETURN A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT ALONG THE

LINES MR. LEACH HAS DISCLOSED THAT HE INTENDS TO SEEK, WHILE

THE CHANGES IN LANGUAGE MAY BE LIMITED AND DESIGNED TO DO

MINIMAL VIOLENCE TO THE WORDS WITHIN THE INDICTMENT, THE

FUNDAMENTAL SCOPE OF THE INDICTMENT CHANGES SIGNIFICANTLY.

THE INDICTMENT, THE PROPOSED INDICTMENT, OR THE POTENTIAL SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT THAT MR. LEACH HAS STATED THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTENDS TO SEEK SIGNIFICANTLY EXPANDS THE TIME PERIOD THAT HAS BEEN THE FOCUS OF THE CASE. THE COMPANY DURING THE 2010 TO 2013 TIME PERIOD WAS IN A FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT STATE OF OPERATIONS THAN IT WAS DURING THE LATER TIME PERIOD

10:41AM 1 2 10:42AM 3 10:42AM 10:42AM 4 10:42AM 10:42AM 6 10:42AM 7 10:42AM 8 10:42AM 9 10:42AM 10 10:42AM 11 10:42AM 12 10:42AM 13 10:42AM 14 10:43AM 15 10:43AM 16 10:43AM 17 10:43AM 18 10:43AM 19 10:43AM 20 10:43AM 21 10:43AM 22 10:43AM 23 10:43AM 24 10:43AM 25

THAT WAS IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS CONSPIRACY PERIOD. THE -ALTHOUGH THE GOVERNMENT HAS IN DRAFTING, IT APPEARS, INTENT ON
CHANGING THE DEFINITION OF INVESTORS AND THE SCOPE OF THE
INVESTOR RELATED CONSPIRACY TO INCLUDE OTHER PARTIES, IT DOES
NOT APPEAR TO US, BASED ON WHAT HAS BEEN REPRESENTED BY THE
GOVERNMENT, THAT THOSE ARE REALLY INVESTOR RELATIONSHIPS AT
ALL.

IN FACT, THOSE RELATIONSHIPS, RELATIONSHIPS LIKE THE
WALGREENS RELATIONSHIP, THE SAFEWAY RELATIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIPS
WITH BOARD OF DIRECTORS ARE FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT
RELATIONSHIPS THAN INVESTOR RELATIONSHIPS.

WALGREENS, SAFEWAY ARE CONTRACTUAL COUNTERPARTIES WITH
THERANOS. THE COURSE OF DEALING BETWEEN THERANOS AND THOSE
CONTRACTUAL COUNTERPARTIES IS FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT IN NATURE
AND SCOPE FROM THE INVESTOR-RELATED RELATIONSHIPS THAT WERE
OUTLINED IN THE PRIOR INDICTMENT.

THE INTERACTIONS WITH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ALSO
SIMILARLY ARE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND BOARD MEMBERS
AMONG FIDUCIARIES WITHIN THE COMPANY AND ARE OF A COMPLETELY
DIFFERENT NATURE FROM THE ALLEGATIONS THAT WERE SET FORTH IN
THE PRIOR INDICTMENT.

THEY REQUIRE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF PREPARATION, THEY RAISE DIFFERENT LEGAL ISSUES, WHICH WILL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL MOTIONS SHOULD THE GRAND JURY RETURN AN INDICTMENT, AND FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGE THE NATURE OF OUR TRIAL PREPARATION.

10:43AM 1 2 10:43AM 3 10:44AM 10:44AM 4 10:44AM 10:44AM 10:44AM 7 8 10:44AM 10:44AM 9 10:44AM 10 10:44AM 11 10:44AM 12 10:44AM 13 10:44AM 14 10:45AM 15 10:45AM 16 10:45AM 17 10:45AM 18 10:45AM 19 10:45AM 20 10:45AM 21 10:45AM 22 10:45AM 23 10:45AM 24

10:45AM 25

I'LL SAY WITH A BIT OF FRUSTRATION THAT I WILL CONFESS TO THE COURT, ALTHOUGH MR. LEACH SUGGESTS THAT SOME OF THESE CHANGES FLOW FROM THE ORDER OF THE COURT AND THE MOTIONS TO DISMISS, WHICH OF COURSE WERE BRIEFED ON THE SCHEDULE THAT WAS AGREED TO BY ALL PARTIES AND PRESENTED AND APPROVED BY THE COURT, WHILE THOSE CHANGES MAY HAVE RESULTED WITH RESPECT TO THE NEW COUNTS RELATED TO THE PATIENTS, THE ORDER OF THE COURT HAS LITTLE OR NOTHING TO DO WITH THE EXPANSION OF THE INVESTOR-RELATED CONSPIRACY TO INCLUDE NEW THEORIES, NEW COUNTERPARTIES, NEW FIDUCIARIES, THAT HAVE LONG BEEN KNOWN TO THE GOVERNMENT AND WHICH THE GOVERNMENT HAS PREVIOUSLY CHOSEN NOT TO CHARGE.

WHY IT TOOK UNTIL THIS POINT TO ADD THOSE CHARGES TO THIS

CASE IS UNCLEAR TO THE DEFENSE. IT'S OF SOME FRUSTRATION GIVEN

ALL OF THE WORK THAT WE HAVE DONE THUS FAR.

AS THE COURT KNOWS, THERE ARE OVER 20 MILLION PAGES OF DOCUMENTS IN THIS CASE. MANY OF THOSE DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED WITH THE CURRENT INDICTMENT IN MIND. MANY OF THOSE DOCUMENTS WILL NOW NEED TO BE REVIEWED. MANY OF THE WITNESSES WILL NEED TO BE REASSESSED. THE HUNDREDS OF WITNESS STATEMENTS WILL NEED TO BE REVIEWED AND ADDRESSED WITH THE NATURE OF THESE ALLEGATIONS IN MIND, AGAIN, SHOULD THE GRAND JURY CHOOSE TO RETURN THIS INDICTMENT AND SHOULD THE CHARGES SURVIVE A MOTION TO DISMISS.

THAT'S A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF WORK ABOVE AND BEYOND THE

10:45AM 1 2 10:46AM 3 10:46AM 10:46AM 4 10:46AM 10:46AM 6 10:46AM 7 10:46AM 8 10:46AM 9 10:46AM 10 10:46AM 11 10:46AM 12 10:46AM 13 10:46AM 14 10:46AM 15 10:46AM 16 10:47AM 17 10:47AM 18 10:47AM 19 10:47AM 20 10:47AM 21 10:47AM 22 10:47AM 23 10:47AM 24 10:47AM 25

WORK THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN BEFORE US IN THIS MATTER.

FORTUNATELY, PERHAPS MAYBE ONE OF THE FEW UNFORTUNATE

THINGS THAT HAS COME FROM THE CURRENT HEALTH CRISIS, WE BELIEVE

THAT WE CAN STILL DO THAT WITHIN THIS AMOUNT OF TIME IN ADVANCE

OF EARLY 2021 WHEN WE THINK IT'S SENSIBLE TO PROCEED WITH THIS

MATTER IN ANY EVENT.

BUT WE THINK THE MINIMIZATION OF THESE ALLEGATIONS BY THE GOVERNMENT IS ONE WITH WHICH WE RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE AND ONE THAT REQUIRES SIGNIFICANTLY ADDITIONAL TIME.

THERE -- IT IS TRUE THAT SOME OF THESE RELATIONSHIPS WERE PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INDICTMENT. WALGREENS, FOR EXAMPLE, IS SET FORTH IN THE INDICTMENT WITH THE ALLEGATION BEING THAT SOME OF THE DEALINGS WITH RESPECT TO WALGREENS WERE MISREPRESENTED TO OTHER INVESTORS.

THE NEW ALLEGATIONS WITHIN THE INDICTMENT ARE TOTALLY DIFFERENT. THERANOS IS SUGGESTING THAT WALGREENS ITSELF MAY HAVE BEEN DEFRAUDED IN SOME WAY.

WE, OF COURSE, WILL AGGRESSIVELY CONTEST THOSE

ALLEGATIONS, BUT THE TYPE OF PREPARATION REQUIRED TO DO SO IS

FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE PREPARATION THAT WE HAVE

ENGAGED IN THUS FAR.

I'LL PAUSE THERE AND ASK IF THE COURT HAS ANY INQUIRIES,
I'M HAPPY TO ADDRESS THEM.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, MR. WADE. THANK YOU FOR OUTLINING THE CHALLENGES THAT THE DEFENSE MIGHT FACE

10:47AM 1 2 10:47AM 3 10:47AM 10:47AM 4 10:48AM 10:48AM 6 10:48AM 8 10:48AM 10:48AM 9 10:48AM 10 10:48AM 11 10:48AM 12 10:48AM 13 10:48AM 14 10:48AM 15 10:48AM 16 10:48AM 17 10:48AM 18 10:48AM 19 10:48AM 20 10:49AM 21 10:49AM 22 10:49AM 23 10:49AM 24 10:49AM 25

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT DECIDE TO SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT.

I'M GOING TO ASK PEOPLE TO PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES, PLEASE MUTE YOU'RE PHONES.

THANK YOU, MR. WADE.

ONE OF THE THOUGHTS AND CONCERNS THAT I HAVE ABOUT THE INFORMATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT THAT THEY MAY SEEK TO SUPERSEDE THE INDICTMENT IS THE TIMING OF THAT. AND THIS IS AGAIN SPECULATION, ASSUMING THAT OUR COURT IS BACK IN OPERATION, THAT IS, THE COURTHOUSE IS OPEN MAY 1ST, IN MAY THE GOVERNMENT WOULD THEN, I'M SURE THEY WOULD PROCEED WITH ALL HASTE TO GET THE GRAND JURY CONVENED AND PRESENT THIS AND THEN WE WOULD HAVE A RETURN.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE TIMELINE OF THAT POTENTIALLY IS, BUT OF COURSE BASED ON MR. WADE'S COMMENTS, AND IT'S COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT WE WOULD EXPECT THAT ANY SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WOULD BE LOOKED AT BY THE DEFENSE WITH CLOSE SCRUTINY AND THEN POTENTIAL MOTIONS TO DISMISS OR SOME OTHER MOTIONS MIGHT ARISE FROM THAT.

YOU'VE GIVEN ME A PROPOSED SCHEDULE IN DOCUMENT 372, AND I'M JUST CURIOUS ABOUT WHAT -- LET'S JUST ASSUME THAT A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IS RECEIVED ALONG THE LINES THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS PROPOSED.

I WONDER FROM BOTH SIDES, CAN YOU GIVE ME YOUR THOUGHTS

ABOUT MOTION PRACTICE IN REGARDS TO THAT AND HOW THAT, THAT IS,

HOW THAT MOTION PRACTICE FITS INTO THE CURRENT PROPOSED

10:49AM 1 2 10:49AM 3 10:49AM 10:49AM 4 10:49AM 5 10:49AM 6 10:49AM 7 10:49AM 8 10:49AM 9 10:50AM 10 10:50AM 11 10:50AM 12 10:50AM 13 10:50AM 14 10:50AM 15 10:50AM 16 10:50AM 17 10:50AM 18 10:50AM 19 10:50AM 20 10:50AM 21 10:50AM 22 10:50AM 23 10:50AM 24

10:50AM 25

SCHEDULES THAT YOU'VE PRESENTED?

MR. LEACH, I'M NOT SURE YOU HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION BECAUSE THE MOTION PRACTICE WOULD BE GENERATED, OF COURSE, BY THE DEFENSE, BUT I'M HAPPY TO START WITH YOU IF YOU HAVE SOME THOUGHTS ON THAT.

MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THAT'S RIGHT, I DON'T HAVE A SENSE OF WHAT MOTIONS THEY INTEND, AND SO I'M NOT REALLY IN A POSITION TO TALK ABOUT THE TIMING OF THAT.

I DO THINK UNDER THE SCHEDULE PROPOSED BY THE GOVERNMENT
WE HAVE MOTIONS IN LIMINE NOT STARTING UNTIL AUGUST, AND WE
HAVE A STATUS CONFERENCE FOR JULY 13TH.

I WOULD CERTAINLY THINK THAT -- I MEAN, WE HAVE BEEN AS

TRANSPARENT ABOUT -- BY PROVIDING THE SUPERSEDING, DRAFT

SUPERSEDING INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT'S INTENTIONS

ARE.

I WOULD THINK THAT THE DEFENSE HAS IN MIND WHAT THEY WANT TO DO.

I THINK IF WE HAVE A MID-JULY, LATE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE
THAT SHOULD AFFORD SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THEM TO DRAFT THE
GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE ANYTHING THAT THEY THINK IS APPROPRIATE.
I REALLY DON'T HAVE A SENSE OF WHAT THEY HAVE IN MIND, BUT WE
WOULD BE PREPARED TO PROCEED UNDER WHATEVER SCHEDULE THE COURT
THINKS IS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

THAT'S A THOUGHT THAT CAME TO MIND, MR. WADE -- I'LL NEXT 1 10:51AM 2 CALL UPON YOU -- IS IF THE GOVERNMENT PROCEEDED -- WELL, 10:51AM THERE'S A LOT OF "IF'S" HERE. ASSUMING WE'RE BACK IN THE 3 10:51AM 10:51AM 4 COURTHOUSE IN MAY AND THE GOVERNMENT IS DILIGENT ABOUT CONVENING A GRAND JURY, AND THE GRAND JURY DOES RETURN A 10:51AM SUPERSEDING DOCUMENT AS THEY'VE INDICATED, AND AS THEY'VE 10:51AM PROVIDED TO YOU, THE NEXT THOUGHT I HAVE REGARDING SCHEDULING 10:51AM 7 IS WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT GETTING MOTION PRACTICE AS TO 8 10:51AM THAT SUPERSEDING DOCUMENT COMPLETED BY THE JULY, ASSUMING WE 10:51AM 9 10:51AM 10 FOLLOW A JULY, A LATE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE? 10:51AM 11 MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, OF COURSE THE WAY THAT WE 10:51AM 12 USUALLY APPROACH A SCHEDULE IN A CASE IS TO START WITH WHEN WE 10:52AM 13 THINK BASED UPON THE INDICTMENT WHEN A TRIAL DATE -- WHEN WE 10:52AM 14 COULD BE READY FOR TRIAL AND WE TRY TO WORK BACK AND SET A 10:52AM 15 LOGICAL AND SEQUENTIAL PATH BETWEEN THAT TRIAL DATE AND TO HIT ALL OF THESE ITEMS. 10:52AM 16 10:52AM 17 A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT THAT IS RETURNED, IF THE GRAND 10:52AM 18 JURY RETURNS IN MAY, AND I'LL NOTE THAT I DO HAVE MATTERS IN 10:52AM 19 OTHER COURTS WHERE GRAND JURIES WERE INITIALLY EXTENDED UNTIL 10:52AM 20 MAY, BUT THAT'S NOW BEEN -- THOSE GRAND JURIES HAVE NOW BEEN 10:52AM 21 DEFERRED FURTHER INTO JULY. BUT IF IT COMES IN MAY, YOU KNOW, 10:52AM 22 WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY NEED TIME TO ADDRESS TO CONSIDER THAT. 10:52AM 23 WE'LL, OF COURSE, BASED ON THE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE 10:52AM 24 GOVERNMENT, BEGIN THINKING ABOUT WAYS IN WHICH WE MIGHT 10:52AM 25 APPROACH SUCH CHARGES IF THE GRAND JURY DECIDES TO CONVENE THEM OR TO RETURN THEM.

1

2

3

10:53AM

10:53AM

10:53AM

10:53AM

10:53AM 4

10:53AM 6

10:53AM 7

10:53AM 8

10:53AM 9

10:53AM 10

10:53AM 11

10:53AM 12

10:53AM 13

10:54AM 14

10:54AM 15

10:54AM 16

10:54AM 17

10:54AM 18

10:54AM 19

10:54AM 20

10:54AM 21

10:54AM 22

10:54AM 23

10:54AM 24

BUT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF OTHER, YOU KNOW, RELATED ISSUES
THAT COME INTO THE CASE AS A RESULT OF THAT ACTIVITY THAT WOULD
ALSO NEED TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE SCHEDULE.

THERE'S A POTENTIAL NEED FOR SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL WORK
THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED BY THE DEFENSE BASED ON INFORMATION
PROVIDED TO THE GOVERNMENT AS TO WHAT THEY MIGHT SEEK. WE
BELIEVE WE MAY NEED TO RETAIN AN EXPERT OR MORE GIVEN THE
NATURE OF SOME OF THE ALLEGATIONS.

MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO THE GOVERNMENT HAS IDENTIFIED, MANY
OF THE WITNESSES WHO HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED WHO WOULD BE
IMPLICATED BY AN INDICTMENT OF THIS TYPE WE HAVE NOT
SUBPOENAED, WE HAVE NOT SOUGHT DOCUMENTS, WE HAVE NOT DONE WHAT
WE WOULD DO IN AN ORDINARY COURSE IF THESE ALLEGATIONS WERE IN
THE INDICTMENT.

SO OF COURSE NOW IT'S NOT PRUDENT GIVEN HEALTH CONDITIONS
TO PROCEED WITH SOME OF THOSE SUBPOENAS UNLESS PEOPLE WERE TO
ACCEPT THEM VOLUNTARILY.

SO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT NEED TO HAPPEN. I
THINK WE UNDOUBTEDLY COULD TRY TO MEET AND CONFER WITH THE
GOVERNMENT AND WOULD IN ANY COURSE ONCE WE DETERMINE A
REASONABLE TRIAL DATE TO TRY TO SET A SENSIBLE SCHEDULE, BUT I
THINK TRYING TO INJECT THIS INTO THESE ALREADY DIFFICULT
CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD NECESSITATE A DELAY IN THE VIEW OF THE
DEFENSE.

10:55AM	1	(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
10:55AM	2	MR. WADE: IS THE COURT STILL THERE?
10:55AM	3	THE COURT: I AM STILL HERE, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT, I
10:55AM	4	DID NOT HAVE THE GOOD SENSE TO UNMUTE MY PHONE.
10:55AM	5	THANK YOU. SO THANK YOU, MR. WADE. THANK YOU FOR THAT.
10:55AM	6	WHAT I HEAR YOU SAYING IS THAT SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT
10:55AM	7	PROCEED AND SECURE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT ALONG THE LINES OF
10:55AM	8	THE PROPOSED DRAFT THAT THEY HAVE PROVIDED YOU, IT WOULD CHANGE
10:55AM	9	THE COMPLEXION OF YOUR OBVIOUSLY OF WHAT YOU NEED TO DO.
10:55AM	10	YOU WOULD LOOK AT THE CASE AND DETERMINE WHETHER YOU CAN GO
10:55AM	11	FORWARD WITH FILING MOTIONS, YOUR MOTIONS PRIOR TO THE JULY
10:55AM	12	DATE AND THE STATUS DATE THAT WE HAVE.
10:56AM	13	THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO SEE IF WE CAN, IF WE CAN GET
10:56AM	14	MOTION PRACTICE SCHEDULED AND HEARD BY THAT DATE, THAT WOULD BE
10:56AM	15	IDEAL AT LEAST FOR MOVING FORWARD.
10:56AM	16	I WAS PROBING TO SEE IF THAT OF COURSE YOU CAN'T
10:56AM	17	PREDICT ANYTHING AND YOU DON'T HAVE BENEFIT OF ANYTHING IN
10:56AM	18	FRONT OF YOU. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO.
10:56AM	19	MR. WADE: YEAH. MY APOLOGIES. IT'S DIFFICULT
10:56AM	20	SOMETIMES TO NOT INTERRUPT THE COURT IN THIS FORUM. SO MY
10:56AM	21	APOLOGIES TO THE COURT.
10:56AM	22	THE COURT: NO, NO, NOT AT ALL.
10:56AM	23	MR. WADE: THE WE, OF COURSE, WOULD WORK TO
10:56AM	24	PROCEED WITH MOTIONS DIRECTED AT ANY NEW INDICTMENT AS QUICKLY
10:56AM	25	AS WE POSSIBLY COULD, YOUR HONOR, JUST TO BE CLEAR.

10:57AM	1	MY OTHER COMMENTS ARE JUST DIRECTED AND TO THE EXTENT
10:57AM	2	THAT AN INDICTMENT WAS RETURNED, YOU KNOW, REASONABLY IN
10:57AM	3	ADVANCE OF THE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE, WE WOULD CERTAINLY
10:57AM	4	ENDEAVOR TO TRY TO FIT BRIEFING IN IN ADVANCE OF THAT.
10:57AM	5	MY OTHER COMMENTS WERE MERELY DIRECTED MEANT TO DIRECT
10:57AM	6	THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT THERE IS OBVIOUSLY MUCH
10:57AM	7	MORE THAT IS NEEDED HERE BEYOND JUST THE BRIEFING ON THE MOTION
10:57AM	8	TO DISMISS.
10:57AM	9	THE COURT: SURE. THANK YOU.
10:57AM	10	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. LET ME ASK, MR. LEACH, ANYTHING
10:57AM	11	YOU WOULD LIKE TO SAY ABOUT THE SCHEDULING ISSUE REGARDING THE
10:57AM	12	MOTIONS AND THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT?
10:57AM	13	MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. JUST THAT I
10:57AM	14	FUNDAMENTALLY DISAGREE THAT THIS IS A SEA CHANGE. THIS IS THE
10:57AM	15	SAME THEORY AND THE SAME CASE WITH DISCOVERY THAT THEY'VE HAD
10:58AM	16	FOR THE BETTER PART OF A YEAR AND A HALF.
10:58AM	17	THE DEFENSE IS IN A MUCH BETTER POSITION TO DESCRIBE ITS
10:58AM	18	PREPARATION THAN WE ARE, BUT WE FUNDAMENTALLY JUST DO NOT SEE
10:58AM	19	THIS AS THE SEA CHANGE THAT IS DESCRIBED. AND BUT BEYOND
10:58AM	20	THAT, I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.
10:58AM	21	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:58AM	22	MR. WADE, ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD?
10:58AM	23	MR. WADE: NO, YOUR HONOR.
10:58AM	24	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:58AM	25	THE STATUS HEARING TODAY WAS SCHEDULED TO DETERMINE WHAT

WE SHOULD DO GOING FORWARD IN LIGHT OF THE COVID CRISIS THAT 1 10:58AM THE NATION FACES AND IN LIGHT OF THE LIMITATIONS THAT THAT 2 10:58AM BRINGS TO THIS COURT TO PROVIDE SAFE ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL 3 10:58AM 10:58AM 4 PARTIES TO THE CASE AS WELL AS THE PUBLIC AND ALL OF OUR COURT 10:58AM 5 PERSONNEL AS WELL. 10:59AM 6 WE HAVE, AS I THINK SOMEONE SAID, WE'RE IN UNCHARTERED 10:59AM 7 WATERS NOW AND TERRITORY NOW IN REGARDS TO HOW TO MANAGE OUR CALENDARS. WE KNOW THAT THE PRIME DIRECTIVE IS TO ENSURE THAT 10:59AM 8 ALL PARTIES RECEIVE FAIR TREATMENT IN THE COURTS, BUT THE REAL 10:59AM 9 10:59AM 10 PRIME DIRECTIVE NOW ADDENDUM TO THAT IS TO PROCEED WITH CAUTION 10:59AM 11 AND SAFETY TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE WHO ENTERS OUR COURTS ARE SAFE, FIRST OF ALL. THAT WE OPEN OUR COURTS, WHEN WE OPEN OUR 10:59AM 12 10:59AM 13 COURTS, THAT THEY ARE IN A SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR ALL, ALL CONCERNED, INCLUDING THE PUBLIC, THE PUBLIC WHO WE WOULD CALL 10:59AM 14 10:59AM 15 AS JURORS TO SIT IN THE MATTER. AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE JURORS HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THE COURTROOMS THAT THEY'RE 10:59AM 16 10:59AM 17 SITTING IN --10:59AM 18 THE CLERK: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. I BELIEVE 10:59AM 19 SOMEONE NEEDS TO MUTE THEIR PHONE. THERE'S INTERRUPTION GOING 11:00AM 20 ON. IF YOU COULD PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONE. 11:00AM 21 THE COURT: YES, YES. PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES, 11:00AM 22 PLEASE. THANK YOU. 11:00AM 23 THE CLERK: SORRY, YOUR HONOR. 11:00AM 24 THE COURT: THANK YOU. THANK YOU, MS. KRATZMANN. 11:00AM 25 WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THE ENVIRONMENT IS SAFE FOR ALL

1 11:00AM 2 11:00AM 3 11:00AM 11:00AM 4 11:00AM 11:00AM 11:00AM 7 8 11:00AM 11:00AM 9 11:00AM 10 11:01AM 11 11:01AM 12 11:01AM 13 11:01AM 14 11:01AM 15 11:01AM 16 11:01AM 17 11:01AM 18 11:01AM 19 11:01AM 20 11:01AM 21 11:01AM 22 11:01AM 23 11:02AM 24

11:02AM 25

PARTIES, WE NEED TO ENSURE TO OUR JURORS, THE PUBLIC THAT WE CALL, THE COMMUNITY THAT IS CALLED TO HEAR MATTERS, THAT THE COURT CAN ENSURE THEIR SAFETY SUCH THAT THEY HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEIR JUSTICE SYSTEM AND THEY HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THEY CAN FOCUS ON THE ISSUES BEFORE THEM IN A TRIAL SUCH THAT THEY CAN PROVIDE A FAIR HEARING FOR ALL SIDES. THAT'S A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF THE WORK THAT THEY DO AND WHAT WE WANT TO ENSURE TO THE JURY IN THIS CASE.

I DO THINK THAT LOOKING AT OUR SCHEDULE AND THIS COURT HAS BEEN, AND I KNOW COUNSEL HAVE CALLED ME ON IT, IS I'VE BEEN A LITTLE AGGRESSIVE ABOUT THE TRIAL SCHEDULE ON THIS. I DO THINK THAT THE SCHEDULE FOR JULY AS I INITIALLY PROPOSED IS NOT REALISTIC NOW GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WE FACE. I JUST DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S A REALITY.

I'D LIKE TO THINK THAT, AND I HOPE THAT TRIAL IN OCTOBER
OF THIS YEAR IS SOMETHING THAT WE COULD, WE COULD ENGAGE. I
KNOW EVERY DAY THE NEWS CHANGES ABOUT COVID AND ABOUT WHETHER
OR NOT THINGS WILL BEGIN TO REACH NORMALITY AND THAT DOESN'T
MEAN THAT WE'LL HAVE ANY NORMAL SENSE OF OUR SOCIETY IN
OCTOBER. WE HOPE WE DO, BUT SHELTER IN PLACE REMAINS AND IN
MANY STATES, AND CERTAINLY IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND JURISDICTION
OF THE COURTHOUSE.

I'D LIKE TO -- WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS LOOK AT THE OCTOBER

DATE, THE LATER OCTOBER DATE THAT WAS PROPOSED AS A POTENTIAL

TRIAL DATE, AND I THINK IT WISE, AND I'M GRATEFUL TO BOTH SIDES

1 11:02AM 2 11:02AM 3 11:02AM 11:02AM 4 11:02AM 11:02AM 11:02AM 7 8 11:02AM 11:02AM 9 11:02AM 10 11:02AM 11 11:03AM 12 11:03AM 13 11:03AM 14 11:03AM 15 11:03AM 16 11:03AM 17 11:03AM 18 11:03AM 19 11:03AM 20 11:03AM 21 11:03AM 22 11:03AM 23 11:03AM 24 11:04AM 25

HERE, TO SUGGEST THAT WE HAVE AN INTERIM STATUS CONFERENCE IN

JULY AT LEAST CALENDARED. THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT WE WON'T

ADVANCE THAT IF NEEDED, BUT AT LEAST CALENDARED IN JULY SO WE

CAN LOOK FORWARD AND SEE WHAT AND HOW BEST WE CAN FORECAST

WHETHER OR NOT THE OCTOBER DATE IS A REALITY OR WHETHER OR NOT

IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO LOOK BEYOND THE FALL AND INTO THE NEW

YEAR, EARLY NEW YEAR.

WHAT I THINK WE HAVE ALL READ AND FROM EXPERTS, AND THERE
ARE MANY OF THEM ON THIS CRISIS THAT WE FACE, THE INFORMATION
AT LEAST THAT THE COURT HAS READ AND SOME OF IT HAS INDICATED
THAT LIKE THE NORMAL FLU VIRUS THAT SEEMS TO COME AROUND IN THE
WINTER AND FALL, THERE'S AN EXPECTATION THAT THIS COVID MAY
RETURN IN THE FALL IN SOME MANNER AND WE SHOULD BE COGNIZANT OF
THAT.

WE'RE SO GRATEFUL FOR OUR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS AND ALL OF THOSE SCIENTISTS AND BIOENGINEERS WHO ARE WORKING DILIGENTLY TO TRY AND TO FIND SOME TYPE OF SERUM THAT CAN PROTECT ALL OF US, A VACCINE THAT CAN PROTECT ALL OF US FROM THIS DISEASE.

BUT WE ALL KNOW THAT TAKES TIME, IT DOES TAKE TIME.

WE DON'T KNOW -- WE CAN'T FORECAST WHAT THE HEALTH

CONDITIONS OF THIS COUNTRY WILL BE IN RELATION TO COVID. WE

ALL, WE JUST ARE IN DESPAIR WHEN WE READ ABOUT THE LOSS THAT

THIS COVID HAS CAUSED ACROSS THE COUNTRY. WE REALLY ARE -- OUR

HEARTS ARE IN PAIN WHEN WE READ ABOUT NEW YORK, DETROIT, AND

11:04AM	1	OTHER CITIES, LOUISIANA, AND OTHER CITIES. SO WE'RE MINDFUL OF
11:04AM	2	THAT. AND THAT PRESSES UPON ALL OF US AS WE LOOK FORWARD TO
11:04AM	3	WHAT WE CAN DO WITH OUR CASE.
11:04AM	4	SO LET ME SAY WHAT I THINK WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO SET A
11:04AM	5	DATE FOR TRIAL, RESCHEDULE THE TRIAL DATE TO THE OCTOBER 26TH
11:04AM	6	DATE. I HAVE YOUR SCHEDULE IN DOCUMENT 372. I DO THINK THAT
11:04AM	7	WE SHOULD MAKE SOME CHANGES TO THAT SCHEDULE GOING FORWARD.
11:04AM	8	FOLKS, IF YOU HAVE YOUR SCHEDULES IN FRONT OF YOU, I'D
11:04AM	9	LIKE TO GO DOWN SOME OF THE DATES AND DEADLINES AND EVENTS THAT
11:04AM	10	YOU HAVE AND SUGGEST SOME CHANGES TO THAT.
11:05AM	11	THE CLERK: YOUR HONOR, MAY I JUST INTERJECT A
11:05AM	12	MOMENT?
11:05AM	13	THE COURT: YES. YES.
11:05AM	14	THE CLERK: THIS IS ADRIANA. COULD WE SET THE
11:05AM	15	OCTOBER DATE TO OCTOBER 27TH DATE TO TUESDAY?
11:05AM	16	THE COURT: YES, YES. OCTOBER 27TH AT 9:00 A.M. FOR
11:05AM	17	JURY SELECTION.
11:05AM	18	GOING DOWN. THIS IS FOUND ON PAGES 4 AND 5 OF 372. I DO
11:05AM	19	NOTE THAT LET'S START THAT THERE'S AGREEMENT ON THE FIRST
11:05AM	20	SERVICE OF THE SUMMARY PURSUANT TO RULE 16, AND I'M NOT GOING
11:05AM	21	TO DISTURB THAT AT THIS POINT. WE MAY HAVE SOME OTHER COMMENT
11:05AM	22	ON THAT IN A MOMENT.
11:06AM	23	THE GOVERNMENT IN IT'S RULE 16(A) DISCLOSURES WHICH BEGINS
11:06AM	24	ON LINE 26, I THINK THE DATE, WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO ADOPT
11:06AM	25	THE GOVERNMENT DATE ON THAT.

11:06AM	1	I'M LOOKING IN THAT BOX, AND PERHAPS YOU CAN HELP ME,
11:06AM	2	COUNSEL, LINE 27 AND 28 IT INDICATES THE GOVERNMENT SERVE
11:06AM	3	WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS LISTS FOR CASE-IN-CHIEF.
11:06AM	4	WAS THAT THE SAME PROPOSED DATE?
11:06AM	5	MR. LEACH: YEAH, THAT WAS INTENDED TO BE JUNE 26TH,
11:06AM	6	2020.
11:06AM	7	THE COURT: OKAY. AS WELL AS PAGE 5 BEGINNING AT
11:06AM	8	LINE 1, THE 801
11:06AM	9	MR. LEACH: YES.
11:06AM	10	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
11:06AM	11	THEN ALSO ON THE RULE 16B DISCLOSURES ON LINE 3 I'LL ADOPT
11:06AM	12	THE GOVERNMENT'S DATE TO THE LATER DATE OF JULY 6TH ON THAT.
11:06AM	13	THE NEXT BOX, WHICH APPEARS ON LINE 4 THROUGH 6, I'M GOING
11:07AM	14	TO DEFER THAT FOR NOW.
11:07AM	15	ACTUALLY, THE FIRST BOX THAT I TALKED ABOUT, I'M SORRY TO
11:07AM	16	GO BACK, ON PAGE 4, LINE 23, I'M GOING TO DEFER THAT AS WELL
11:07AM	17	FOR NOW.
11:07AM	18	RETURNING TO PAGE 5, NOW WE'RE AT LINE 6 THROUGH 8, THE
11:07AM	19	DEFENSE SERVICE OF WITNESS AND EXHIBIT LISTS, I'M GOING TO
11:07AM	20	ADJUST THAT DATE TO JULY 24TH.
11:07AM	21	AND THEN THE STATUS CONFERENCE WILL BE SET FOR,
11:07AM	22	MS. KRATZMANN, JULY 20TH, JULY 20TH, AT 10:00 A.M.
11:07AM	23	NOW, AT THAT TIME ON JULY 20TH, WE WILL HAVE A BETTER IDEA
11:08AM	24	AS TO WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO GO FORWARD WITH THE OCTOBER TRIAL
11:08AM	25	DATE OR WHETHER WE NEED TO ADJUST THE SCHEDULE IN SOME OTHER

1 11:08AM 2 11:08AM 3 11:08AM 11:08AM 4 11:08AM 11:08AM 6 11:08AM 7 11:08AM 8 11:08AM 9 11:08AM 10 11:08AM 11 11:08AM 12 11:08AM 13 11:09AM 14 11:09AM 15 11:09AM 16 11:09AM 17 11:09AM 18 11:09AM 19 11:09AM 20 11:09AM 21 11:09AM 22 11:09AM 23

11:09AM 24

11:09AM 25

MANNER.

I'M NOT GOING TO -- AT THIS TIME I'M NOT GOING TO

ADOPT ANY OF THE OTHER -- YOU HAVE OTHER DATES THAT BEGIN IN

AUGUST AND OTHERS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINES AND THOSE DATES. I'D

LIKE TO DEFER THOSE DATES. I THINK WE CAN WAIT UNTIL THE

JULY 20TH DATE TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT AND HOW WE'RE GOING TO

PROCEED AND GO FORWARD THERE.

SO I'D LIKE YOU TO -- OBVIOUSLY YOU'RE GOING TO PREPARE

THE CASE AS BEST YOU CAN, I KNOW THAT, BUT I DON'T THINK YOU

NEED TO PAY ATTENTION TO THOSE ITEMS THAT APPEAR FROM LINES 10

DOWN TO 19 AT THIS POINT. I'D LIKE YOU TO FOCUS YOUR EFFORTS,

OF COURSE, ON THE OTHER WORK THAT YOU NEED TO DO, AND WE CAN

LOOK AT THOSE REMAINING ISSUES, THE IN LIMINE AND OTHER ISSUES,

ON THE JULY 20TH STATUS CONFERENCE DATE.

ANY QUESTIONS FROM EITHER SIDE ABOUT THIS ADJUSTMENT?

MR. LEACH: NOT FROM THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR.

THAT'S CLEAR TO US. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: MR. WADE?

MR. WADE: NO, YOUR HONOR. I TAKE IT AS WE GET

CLOSER TO THESE EVENTS WE'LL PERHAPS HAVE COMMUNICATION THROUGH

MS. KRATZMANN AS TO WHETHER THESE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE

TELEPHONIC OR IN PERSON?

OBVIOUSLY, I THINK WE ALL HOPE WE'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE THEY'RE IN PERSON, BUT WE WILL SEE WHAT IS PRUDENT AT THAT TIME.

THE COURT: YES. THANK YOU, MR. WADE. 1 11:09AM I'M HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN, THAT THINGS CHANGE IN OUR COUNTRY 2 11:09AM AND IN OUR REGIONS THAT WE COULD HAVE IN-PERSON MEETINGS. 3 11:09AM 11:09AM 4 AGAIN, I'LL JUST SAY I ALWAYS ENJOY ALL OF YOU IN THE COURTROOM. YOU'RE ALL PROFESSIONAL, AND I APPRECIATE THAT. I 11:10AM 11:10AM 6 KNOW THAT YOU'RE TRIAL LAWYERS AND THE PLACE YOU WORK IS THE 11:10AM 7 COURTROOM, NOT YOUR LIVING ROOMS, KITCHENS, OR HOME OFFICES, WHICH OF COURSE YOU DO THAT IN THE EVENINGS AND INTO THE WEE 11:10AM 8 HOURS OF THE NIGHT, I RECOGNIZE THAT. 11:10AM 9 11:10AM 10 BUT THE PLACE YOU DO YOUR BUSINESS IS IN THE COURTROOM, 11:10AM 11 AND ALL OF YOU HAVE GREAT FLUENCY FOR THE COURTROOM, AND SO I 11:10AM 12 AGREE. I HOPE THAT WE CAN OPEN OUR COURTROOMS SOON, AND WE ALL 11:10AM 13 CAN ENJOY EACH OTHER'S COMPANY. WE'RE WORKING ON WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO ESTABLISH VIDEO 11:10AM 14 11:10AM 15 CONFERENCING IN THE INTERIM, AND SO IF WE NEED IT, HOPEFULLY WE'LL HAVE SOMETHING SET UP FOR FUTURE STATUS CONFERENCES IF WE 11:10AM 16 11:10AM 17 CAN. 11:10AM 18 ALSO, AS TO ANY OTHER MATTERS, AS YOU POINT OUT, MR. WADE, 11:10AM 19 MS. KRATZMANN WILL BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE ANY OTHER SCHEDULE 11:11AM 20 CHANGES FOR ANY OTHER MATTERS AS THEY NEED TO COME UP, AND I 11:11AM 21 DON'T KNOW IF THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION. I HOPE IT DOES. 11:11AM 22 MR. WADE: IT DOES. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 11:11AM 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE THAT EITHER 11:11AM 24 SIDE WISHES TO RAISE AT THIS TIME? 11:11AM 25 MR. LEACH, ANYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S TEAM?

MR. LEACH: YOUR HONOR, IN LIGHT OF THE CHANGE OF 1 11:11AM THE TRIAL DATE FROM OCTOBER -- WELL, FROM THE END OF JULY TO 2 11:11AM OCTOBER 27TH, 2020, I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE 3 11:11AM 11:11AM 4 COURT TO EXCLUDE TIME FOR EFFECTIVE PREPARATION IN LIGHT OF THE 11:11AM 5 COVID CRISIS AND EVERYTHING THAT MR. WADE HAS DESCRIBED. 11:11AM 6 THE COURT: THANK YOU. I WAS GOING TO TURN TO 11:11AM 7 MR. WADE WHEN HIS COMMENTS -- DURING HIS COMMENTS AND ASK HIM IF HE AGREES THAT TIME SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FOR EFFECTIVE 11:11AM 8 PREPARATION OF COUNSEL TO THE NEW TRIAL OF OCTOBER 26TH, 2020. 11:11AM 9 11:12AM 10 MR. WADE? 11:12AM 11 MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, WE DO. I BELIEVE IT ALSO MAY BE COVERED BY ONE OF THE COURT'S GENERAL ORDERS AS WELL, BUT IN 11:12AM 12 11:12AM 13 ANY EVENT, WE DO AGREE. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU THEN. 11:12AM 14 11:12AM 15 ANYTHING FURTHER FROM YOU, MR. WADE, AND YOUR TEAM? MR. WADE: NOT AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 11:12AM 16 11:12AM 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THANK 11:12AM 18 YOU ALL FOR YOUR ATTENTION HERE. WE WILL -- AND LET ME SAY, IF 11:12AM 19 EITHER PARTY WISHES TO HAVE ANOTHER STATUS OR A STATUS 11:12AM 20 CONFERENCE OR BRING ANYTHING TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION, PLEASE 11:12AM 21 FEEL FREE TO DO SO. 11:12AM 22 I'VE SET THE JULY 20TH DATE AS THE CALENDARED STATUS DATE 11:12AM 23 SO WE ALL HAVE AN EVENT HORIZON TO FOCUS ON. BUT SHOULD THE 11:12AM 24 NEED ARISE OR A CHANGE OR SOMETHING HAPPENS, PLEASE CONTACT 11:12AM 25 MS. KRATZMANN, AND WE WILL OF COURSE ENGAGE THE STATUS OR OTHER

11:12AM	1	HEARING AS NEEDED IF THE PARTIES REQUIRE.
11:12AM	2	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. LET ME THANK YOU ALL AGAIN. IT'S
11:12AM	3	GOOD TO HEAR YOUR VOICES. I LOOK FORWARD TO THE OPPORTUNITY
11:13AM	4	WHEN I CAN SEE YOUR FACES PERSONALLY AND WE CAN INVITE YOU BACK
11:13AM	5	TO A SAFE COURTROOM AND I CAN ENJOY YOUR COMPANY AND ALL OF
11:13AM	6	YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS INTERESTING CASE.
11:13AM	7	PLEASE BE SAFE, YOU AND YOUR FAMILIES. I WISH YOU THE
11:13AM	8	BEST AND PLEASE BE SAFE AND WELL, AND WE'LL TALK AGAIN SOON.
11:13AM	9	ANYTHING FURTHER, MS. KRATZMANN?
11:13AM	10	THE CLERK: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
11:13AM	11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. WE'LL DISENGAGE
11:13AM	12	THE LINE NOW. THANK YOU, COUNSEL.
11:13AM	13	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:13AM	14	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR HONOR.
11:13AM	15	(TELEPHONIC COURT CONCLUDED AT 11:13 A.M.)
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074 DATED: JULY 20, 2020 

## **EXHIBIT F**

1			
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
4	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
5	SIEV COOL DIVISION		
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) ) CR-18-00258-EJD		
7	PLAINTIFF, ) ) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA		
8	VS. ) ) JULY 20, 2020 ELIZABETH A. HOLMES AND RAMESH )		
9	SUNNY BALWANI, ) PAGES 1 - 95		
10	DEFENDANTS. )		
11			
12	EDANGODIDE OF GOOM DECORPOING		
13	TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT SUDGE		
15	APPEARANCES BY ZOOM:		
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: JOHN C. BOSTIC		
17	JEFFREY B. SCHENK 150 ALMADEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 900		
18	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113		
19	BY: ROBERT S. LEACH  VANESSA BAEHR-JONES		
20	1301 CLAY STREET, SUITE 340S OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612		
21	(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)		
22	, ,		
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:  IRENE L. RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR		
24	CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074		
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER		

1		
2	<u>APPEARANCESB</u>	Y ZOOM: (CONT'D)
3		WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
4		BY: KEVIN M. DOWNEY  LANCE A. WADE
5		PATRICK J. LOOBY KATHERINE A. TREFZ
6		AMY M. SAHARIA 725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.
7		WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
8		LAW OFFICE OF JOHN D. CLINE BY: JOHN D. CLINE
9		ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 500 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
10	בייטער ארייייטער אריייטער אייטער דייטער אריי	ODDICK REDDINGMON ( GIMCI TEEE IID
11	FOR DEFENDANT BALWANT:	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP BY: JEFFREY COOPERSMITH AMANDA MCDOWELL
12		701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5600 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
13		BY: STEPHEN A. CAZARES
14		77 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3200 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
15		los intelles, ordireratir 30017
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	JULY 20, 2020
	2	PROCEEDII	N G S
10:27AM	3	(COURT CONVENED AT 10:27 A.M.)	
10:27AM	4	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOO	D MORNING EVERYONE.
10:27AM	5	THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR PATIENCE IN MAI	NEUVERING WITH OUR
10:27AM	6	TECHNOLOGY HERE. WE, OF COURSE, ARE	IN THE BREAD BASKET OF
10:27AM	7	SILICON VALLEY AND OF COURSE EVERYTHIN	NG WORKED CORRECTLY THIS
10:27AM	8	MORNING. IT'S GOOD TO SEE EVERYONE.	
10:27AM	9	LET ME START OFF AND WHY DON'T WI	E CAPTURE APPEARANCES OF
10:27AM	10	EVERYONE. THIS IS 18-258, UNITED STA	TES VERSUS
10:27AM	11	ELIZABETH HOLMES AND UNITED STATES VE	RSUS RAMESH "SUNNY"
10:27AM	12	BALWANI.	
10:27AM	13	WHY DON'T WE START WITH THE GOVE	RNMENT. WHO APPEARS FOR
10:27AM	14	THE GOVERNMENT TODAY?	
10:27AM	15	MR. LEACH: GOOD MORNING, Y	OUR HONOR.
10:27AM	16	THIS IS ROBERT LEACH ON BEHALF OF	F THE UNITED STATES, AND
10:28AM	17	JEFF SCHENK, JOHN BOSTIC, AND VANESSA	BAEHR-JONES.
10:28AM	18	THE COURT: THANK YOU. I'M	GOING TO ASK YOU TO MOVE
10:28AM	19	YOUR MICROPHONE CLOSER TO YOU, PLEASE	
10:28AM	20	MR. LEACH: IS THAT BETTER?	
10:28AM	21	THE COURT: YES, MUCH BETTE	R. THANK YOU.
10:28AM	22	AND LET'S TURN THEN TO MS. HOLMES	5.
10:28AM	23	MR. WADE: GOOD MORNING, YO	UR HONOR.
10:28AM	24	LANCE WADE ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLM	ES WHO IS PRESENT WITH ME
10:28AM	25	THIS MORNING, AND I'LL NOTE FOR THE R	ECORD ALSO ABLE TO

10:28AM	1	COMMUNICATE WITH US SEPARATELY VIA TELEPHONE IF WE NEED TO
10:28AM	2	CONFER WITH HER PRIVATELY. SHE IS IN A DIFFERENT LOCATION.
10:28AM	3	MY COLLEAGUES KEVIN DOWNEY, AMY SAHARIA, AND KATIE TREFZ
10:28AM	4	ARE WITH ME, AS IS MR. PATRICK LOOBY WHO I THINK HAS PROBABLY
10:28AM	5	BEEN BEHIND US BEFORE, YOUR HONOR, BUT THIS IS THE FIRST TIME
10:28AM	6	APPEARING BEFORE YOU, SO I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE YOU TO
10:28AM	7	MR. LOOBY.
10:28AM	8	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING, MR. LOOBY.
10:29AM	9	THANK YOU ALL FOR BEING HERE.
10:29AM	10	MR. WADE, LET ME JUST ASK YOU, SIR, THE COVID CRISIS HAS
10:29AM	11	CAUSED US TO ENGAGE VIDEO CONFERENCING PROCEEDINGS FOR VARIOUS
10:29AM	12	HEARINGS IN LIGHT OF THE COURT'S DESIRE TO MITIGATE APPEARANCE
10:29AM	13	IN THE COURTROOMS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AS WELL AS ALL OF YOUR
10:29AM	14	SAFETY.
10:29AM	15	DO I HAVE YOUR CLIENT'S CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS
10:29AM	16	HEARING VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE?
10:29AM	17	MR. WADE: YOU DO, YOUR HONOR.
10:29AM	18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:29AM	19	THANK YOU, MS. HOLMES.
10:29AM	20	LET ME TURN TO MR. BALWANI THEN. IF I COULD GET THE
10:29AM	21	APPEARANCES FOR MR. BALWANI.
10:29AM	22	MR. COOPERSMITH: YES. GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
10:29AM	23	THIS IS JEFF COOPERSMITH ON BEHALF OF MR. BALWANI FROM
10:29AM	24	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE.
10:29AM	25	MR. BALWANI IS ALSO PRESENT ON THE ZOOM.

GOVERNMENT IS GOING TO BE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE SOME ADDITIONAL 1 11:52AM 2 FOUNDATIONAL INFORMATION AND BACKGROUND ON SOME OF THIS 11:52AM 3 TESTIMONY. 11:52AM BUT AGAIN, WE'RE GUIDED BY MS. SAHARIA'S REVELATION THAT 11:52AM 4 11:52AM 5 THERE WILL BE ADDITIONAL LITIGATION ON THE SECOND SUPERSEDING 11:52AM 6 INDICTMENT AND THAT MIGHT DRIVE SOME OF THE THOUGHTS THAT WE 11:52AM 7 HAVE HERE NOW THAT MS. BAEHR-JONES AND HER TEAM HAS INFORMED US THAT SOME OF THIS CONDUCT THAT APPEARS IN THE SECOND 11:53AM 8 SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IS ACTUALLY SOME OF THE 404(B) EVIDENCE. 11:53AM 9 11:53AM 10 SO WHERE DOES THAT LEAVE US THEN, MR. LEACH? WHAT ELSE 11:53AM 11 SHOULD WE TALK ABOUT? 11:53AM 12 MR. LEACH: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE ALSO SET FOR A STATUS CONFERENCE TODAY ON THE OCTOBER 27TH TRIAL DATE. 11:53AM 13 I WILL SAY FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE WE ARE READY 11:53AM 14 11:53AM 15 FOR TRIAL. WE HAVE SERVED OUR WITNESS LISTS ON JUNE 26TH. WE ALSO SERVED OUR EXHIBIT LIST ON THE SAME DAY. WE SERVED A 11:53AM 16 11:53AM 17 NUMBER OF TRIAL SUBPOENAS AND INSTRUCTED WITNESSES TO HOLD THE 11:53AM 18 OCTOBER DATE. 11:53AM 19 I WOULD NOTE MS. HOLMES HAS PRODUCED SOME OF HER RULE 16 11:53AM 20 DISCOVERY. SO WE ARE READY TO GO. 11:54AM 21 I BELIEVE THE DEFENSE HAS SOME PERSPECTIVE ON THIS, AND I 11:54AM 22 THINK IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE TO HEAR FROM THEM ABOUT SOME OF 11:54AM 23 THE CHALLENGES THAT THEY SAY. 11:54AM 24 BUT FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE WE ARE READY TO GO AND WE'RE 11:54AM 25 READY TO ENGAGE ON WHATEVER DIALOGUE THE COURT WISHES TO HAVE

11:54AM	1	ABOUT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES COVID BRINGS IN THIS CASE OR
11:54AM	2	MIGHT BRING.
11:54AM	3	BUT, YOU KNOW, FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE WE'RE
11:54AM	4	READY AND WE'RE ANXIOUS FOR THE TRIAL.
11:54AM	5	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE THAT.
11:54AM	6	WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT, AND OF COURSE THE DEFENSE
11:54AM	7	WILL DIRECT THIS, BUT WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT ADDITIONAL
11:54AM	8	MOTION PRACTICE THAT MS. SAHARIA HAS INFORMED US ABOUT TODAY?
11:54AM	9	ORDER THAT THEY FILE ANY MOTION TOMORROW AT NOON?
11:54AM	10	MR. LEACH: I WOULD BE WILLING TO GIVE THEM A LITTLE
11:54AM	11	BIT MORE TIME ON THAT, YOUR HONOR. I'M NOT SURE EXACTLY OF THE
11:54AM	12	PARAMETERS ON WHAT THEY INTEND TO MOVE ON. I CAN ANTICIPATE
11:54AM	13	SOME OF THEM, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT WE NEED AN EXTENDED
11:55AM	14	BRIEFING SCHEDULE.
11:55AM	15	I THINK THE GOVERNMENT WOULD PROBABLY LIKE TWO TO THREE
11:55AM	16	WEEKS TO RESPOND, BUT I THINK WE SHOULD GET A DATE ON CALENDAR
11:55AM	17	FOR THAT.
11:55AM	18	BUT WE HAVE A SENSE, BASED ON SOME OF THE COMMENTS TODAY,
11:55AM	19	WHAT THEY INTEND TO RAISE. WE'LL RESPOND IN OUR OPPOSITION.
11:55AM	20	BUT I THINK THAT WOULD BE A GOOD THING FOR THE COURT TO
11:55AM	21	DO.
11:55AM	22	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
11:55AM	23	MR. WADE? MS. SAHARIA? MR. DOWNEY?
11:55AM	24	MR. WADE: IT'S MR. WADE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
11:55AM	25	I THINK THERE ARE A COUPLE OF ISSUES TO ADDRESS HERE. ONE

1 11:55AM 2 11:55AM 3 11:55AM 11:55AM 4 11:55AM 11:55AM 6 11:55AM 7 8 11:55AM 11:56AM 9 11:56AM 10 11:56AM 11 11:56AM 12 11:56AM 13 11:56AM 14 11:56AM 15 11:56AM 16 11:56AM 17 11:56AM 18 11:56AM 19 11:56AM 20 11:56AM 21 11:57AM 22 11:57AM 23 11:57AM 24 11:57AM 25

RELATES TO THE MOTIONS AS YOU'VE REFERENCED, BUT REALLY I THINK THAT'S PUTTING THE CART A LITTLE BIT BEFORE THE HORSE.

I THINK ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF THE STATUS CONFERENCE WAS

TO CHECK IN ON THE TRIAL DATE. I THINK WHEN WE SET THE TRIAL

DATE FOR OCTOBER THE COURT PRUDENTLY SUGGESTED THAT WE HAVE A

STATUS CONFERENCE ABOUT THREE MONTHS OUT SO THAT WE COULD CHECK

AND SEE WHERE WE ARE FROM A PUBLIC HEALTH STANDPOINT.

I THINK AT THAT TIME, WHICH SEEMS LIKE A YEAR AGO, BUT IT
WAS JUST A COUPLE MONTHS AGO, I THINK WE WERE ALL OPTIMISTIC ON
OUR ABILITY TO MOVE FORWARD.

WE CERTAINLY, AS THE COURT CAN TELL FROM THESE MOTIONS,

HAVE BEEN WORKING VERY HARD WITH -- AS THE GOVERNMENT HAS AS

WELL, TO TRY TO CONTINUE TO SHARPEN THE ISSUES AND TRY TO

PROCEED TO A POSITION WHERE WE WOULD BE READY TO TRY THE CASE.

WE WERE ALSO OPTIMISTIC, I WOULD SAY, ABOUT THE ABILITY OF
OUR EXPERTS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH FIELD AND OUR LEADERSHIP IN
THE COUNTRY TO BE ABLE TO ADDRESS THIS PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS IN
A WAY THAT MIGHT MAKE THAT POSSIBLE.

I THINK THE COURT HAS ALWAYS EXPRESSED GREAT CARE AS IT
RELATES TO PUBLIC HEALTH ISSUES AND WITH RESPECT TO OUR
CLIENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, AND WE'RE VERY APPRECIATIVE OF
THAT.

I THINK WE ALL WANT A TRIAL HERE THAT IS SAFE FOR ALL

TRIAL PARTICIPANTS FROM A PUBLIC HEALTH STANDPOINT BUT ALSO

SAFE FROM A CONSTITUTIONAL STANDPOINT WHERE OUR CLIENT HAS ALL

1 11:57AM 2 11:57AM 3 11:57AM 11:57AM 4 11:57AM 11:57AM 6 11:57AM 7 11:57AM 8 11:57AM 9 11:57AM 10 11:58AM 11 11:58AM 12 11:58AM 13 11:58AM 14 11:58AM 15 11:58AM 16 11:58AM 17 11:58AM 18 11:58AM 19 11:58AM 20 11:58AM 21 11:58AM 22 11:58AM 23 11:59AM 24 11:59AM 25

OF THE RIGHTS THAT SHE'S ENTITLED TO GIVEN THAT HER LIBERTY IS IN JEOPARDY.

THERE ARE A COUPLE OF FACTORS ABOUT THIS CASE THAT MAKE PROCEEDING TO TRIAL UNIQUELY DIFFICULT ANY TIME SOON.

FIRST, OBVIOUSLY THIS IS NOT A TYPICAL ONE WEEK OR EVEN TWO WEEK TRIAL. THIS IS SET TO BE A VERY LENGTHY TRIAL.

EVEN AFTER THE CASE WAS SEVERED, I THINK THE COURT KNOWS

THE GOVERNMENT HAS INDICATED THAT IT INTENDS TO PROCEED WITH

THE SAME LENGTH OF CASE AND IT INTENDS TO CALL THE SAME NUMBER

OF WITNESSES, INDEED THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT EXPANDED THE

CASE SIGNIFICANTLY.

AS A RESULT OF THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT A THREE MONTH TRIAL, PERHAPS MORE, TO MOVE THIS CASE FORWARD TO COMPLETION.

OBVIOUSLY ALONG WITH A TRIAL OF THAT LENGTH, PROCEEDING IN THE MIDST OF A PANDEMIC COME GREAT RISKS. THERE ARE -- WE WILL ALL -- THERE WILL BE 30 TRIAL PARTICIPANTS WHO WILL BE IN AN INDOOR CONFINED SPACE WHICH THE CDC AND OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH EXPERTS TELL US IT IS NOT ADVISABLE UNDER CURRENT CONDITIONS.

EVEN IF MASKED, EVEN IF DISTANCED, ISSUES RAISE OTHER

POTENTIAL CONCERNS AS IT RELATES TO OUR CLIENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL

RIGHTS.

JUST A TRIAL FOR THAT LENGTH OF TIME PRESENTS UNIQUE OBSTACLES.

OBVIOUSLY WHAT COMES -- WHAT DRIVES THAT AMOUNT OF TIME

ARE THE NUMBER OF WITNESSES THAT WOULD BE CALLED AT TRIAL. THE

1 11:59AM 2 11:59AM 3 11:59AM 11:59AM 4 11:59AM 11:59AM 6 11:59AM 7 8 11:59AM 11:59AM 9 11:59AM 10 12:00PM 11 12:00PM 12 12:00PM 13 12:00PM 14 12:00PM 15 12:00PM 16 12:00PM 17 12:00PM 18 12:00PM 19 12:00PM 20 12:00PM 21 12:00PM 22 12:00PM 23 12:00PM 24

12:01PM 25

GOVERNMENT HAS IDENTIFIED A WITNESS LIST, HAS DISCLOSED A
WITNESS LIST TO THE DEFENSE IN THIS CASE RECENTLY. IT
IDENTIFIES, IF YOU INCLUDE DOCUMENT CUSTODIANS, 170 WITNESSES.

THOSE WITNESSES COME FROM AT LEAST 15 DIFFERENT STATES,
INCLUDING MANY THAT ARE HOT SPOTS SUCH AS ARIZONA WHERE THERE
ARE 20 WITNESSES, TEXAS, GEORGIA, FLORIDA, AND ALL DIFFERENT
PARTS OF CALIFORNIA.

CDC GUIDANCE WOULD SUGGEST THAT IF ANY WITNESS WERE TO FLY TO CALIFORNIA TO TESTIFY AT TRIAL, THEY SHOULD FIRST QUARANTINE THEMSELVES FOR 14 DAYS BEFORE THEY EXPOSED THEMSELVES TO OTHERS GIVEN THAT THEY'RE COMING FROM A PLACE WHERE THERE ARE A GREAT NUMBER OF INFECTIONS.

HOW THAT IS PRUDENT -- THAT IS NOT PRUDENT.

SIMILARLY, I THINK THE COURT KNOWS BETTER THAN I DO
BECAUSE YOU ARE OBVIOUSLY LIVING THERE, THAT CALIFORNIA IS
EXPERIENCING A PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT PERIOD. THE PANDEMIC
THERE STATISTICALLY HAS GOTTEN WORSE, NOT BETTER, SINCE IT
BEGAN.

THREE OF THE FOUR COUNTIES THAT PROVIDE JURORS THAT WOULD SERVE IN A JURY POOL HERE ARE ON THE GOVERNOR'S MONITORING LIST. MANY ARE ROLLING BACK SOME OF THE OPENING MEASURES THAT THEY HAD TAKEN INITIALLY EARLY ON AND ARE GOING IN THE WRONG DIRECTION, AND MANY OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM WHERE WE WOULD DRAW JURORS ARE NOT GOING TO HAVE KIDS IN SCHOOL.

THE ABILITY TO GET AN IMPARTIAL JURY IN THIS SETTING FOR A

TRIAL OF THIS LENGTH IS DOUBTFUL. IT AT LEAST PRESENTS A LOT OF LEGAL ISSUES THAT WOULD BE CHALLENGING.

AT MORE BASIC LEVEL, YOUR HONOR, AS WE THINK THROUGH THESE STEPS AND WE THINK ABOUT THE WAYS IN WHICH THIS TRIAL MIGHT PROCEED OVER THREE MONTHS, WHAT HAPPENS IF A MONTH AND A HALF IN I WAKE UP WITH A SORE THROAT? WHAT HAPPENS IF ONE OF THE JURORS DOES OR THE COURT OR A MEMBER OF THE COURT STAFF? DO WE ADJOURN COURT FOR THE DAY? DO WE QUARANTINE FOR 14 DAYS? DO WE QUARANTINE UNTIL WE GET A TEST RESULT? THESE ARE CHALLENGING ISSUES.

I KNOW THAT THESE ARE ISSUES THAT ARE NOT UNIQUE TO THIS

CASE. I KNOW THAT THESE ARE ISSUES THAT THE COURT IS

STRUGGLING WITH IN MANY CASES, AND IT IS HAVING TO BALANCE

THOSE INTERESTS AND THOSE CONCERNS AGAINST OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL

RIGHTS SUCH AS DEMANDS FOR SPEEDY TRIAL, SITUATIONS IN WHICH

DEFENDANTS ARE IN CUSTODY, AND WE KNOW THAT THE COURT IS

LABORING TO DO THAT.

WE'VE WATCHED SOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE OTHER COURTS
IN THIS DISTRICT. WE ADMIRE, FRANKLY, THE BRAVERY WITH WHICH
MANY OF THE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS ARE PROCEEDING THERE RECOGNIZING
THAT THEY'RE AT RISK.

BUT THE PROCEEDINGS THAT WE HAVE SEEN SO FAR ARE SHORT IN NATURE. THEY DON'T INVOLVE -- THEY HAVEN'T INVOLVED TRIALS

THAT ARE NATIONAL IN SCOPE WITH WITNESSES SCATTERED ACROSS THE UNITED STATES.

1

2

3

4

12:01PM

12:01PM

12:01PM

12:01PM

12:01PM

12:01PM 6

12:01PM 7

12:01PM 8

12:01PM 9

12:01PM 10

12:01PM 11

12:01PM 12

12:02PM 13

12:02PM 14

12:02PM 15

12:02PM 16

12:02PM 17

12:02PM 18

12:02PM 19

12:02PM 20

12:02PM 21

12:02PM 22

12:02PM 23

12:02PM 24

12:02PM 25

SO WE HAVE UNIQUE FACTORS HERE THAT MAKE OUR OBSTACLES

12:02PM 2 RATHER EXTRAORDINARY.

12:02PM 3 AS THE COURT LIKELY KNOWS, IN ADDITION TO THE WORSENING

12:03PM

12:03PM

12:03PM 6

12:03PM 7

12:03PM 8

12:03PM 9

12:03PM 10

12:03PM 11

12:03PM 12

12:03PM 13

12:03PM 14

12:03PM 15

12:03PM 16

12:04PM 17

12:04PM 18

12:04PM 19

12:04PM 20

12:04PM 21

12:04PM 22

12:04PM 23

12:04PM 24

12:04PM 25

4

PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS, WE ALSO HAVE PREDICTIONS FROM SOME OF THE LEADING HEALTH EXPERTS IN THE FIELD, DR. FAUCI, DR. REDFIELD OF THE CDC, THAT SUGGEST THAT THINGS COULD WELL GET WORSE IN THE FALL AND WINTER AS A RESULT OF THE COMBINED EFFECT OF THE INFLUENZA AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC. THEY PREDICT THAT WE COULD SEE NUMBERS AND CONDITIONS THAT ARE FAR WORSE.

WE WOULD SUGGEST TO THE COURT THAT WE RECOGNIZE THIS

REALITY. THE GOVERNMENT HAS ALWAYS TALKED ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE

OF TRYING TO FIND A DATE. THE GOVERNMENT HAS ALWAYS TALKED

ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF TRYING TO BE REALISTIC ABOUT THAT, AND

WE'VE AGREED AND WE'VE TRIED TO DO THAT, AND I KNOW THE COURT

HAS, TOO.

WE THINK A TRIAL ANY TIME SOON IS JUST NOT REALISTIC.

IT'S JUST NOT SAFE.

WE THINK WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT, AND WE THINK WE SHOULD ADJOURN THE TRIAL UNTIL NEXT YEAR.

I WOULD SUGGEST MS. HOLMES TAKING THE SLOT THAT IS

CURRENTLY RESERVED FOR MR. BALWANI IN HIS TRIAL IN APRIL OF

NEXT YEAR WOULD BE PRUDENT. THAT WOULD GET US THROUGH THE COLD

AND FLU SEASON. WE COULD HAVE A STATUS CONFERENCE A COUPLE

MONTHS OUT WHERE WE WOULD AGAIN TALK ABOUT WHETHER PROCEEDING

IS REALISTIC, WHETHER PROCEEDING WILL ENDANGER PEOPLE AND

1 12:04PM 2 12:04PM 3 12:04PM 12:04PM 4 12:04PM 12:05PM 12:05PM 7 8 12:05PM 12:05PM 9 12:05PM 10 12:05PM 11 12:05PM 12 12:05PM 13 12:05PM 14 12:05PM 15 12:05PM 16 12:05PM 17 12:05PM 18 12:05PM 19 12:05PM 20 12:05PM 21 12:06PM 22

12:06PM 23

12:06PM 24

12:06PM 25

ENDANGER WITNESSES OR OTHER TRIAL PARTICIPANTS.

AND IF WE DO THAT, WE CAN ALSO AVOID DANGERS AND COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES THAT WILL COME FROM SERVING. GOING OUT AND SERVING A BUNCH OF TRIAL SUBPOENAS RIGHT NOW, THE COURT HAS MAYBE SEEN THAT IS NOT AN EVENT THAT IS VERY WELL RECEIVED BY WITNESSES IN THE PRESENT HEALTH SITUATION.

I'M SURE -- I KNOW THE COURT WAS WORKING FROM HOME FOR SOME TIME PERIOD. WHEN THERE'S A KNOCK AT THE DOOR IT'S EVEN SOMEWHAT UNSETTLING FOR A LOT OF PEOPLE THESE DAYS, AND WHEN IT'S A PROCESS SERVER IT'S PARTICULARLY UNSETTLING.

SO I APPRECIATE THAT THE COURT SET THIS STATUS CONFERENCE
TO HAVE THIS DIALOGUE NOW, AND I APPRECIATE THE CARE THAT THE
COURT HAS GIVEN TO THESE ISSUES, AND I THINK MOVING THE TRIAL
DATE WOULD BE PRUDENT.

NOW, WE HAVE AND WE'VE TALKED BEFORE ABOUT MOMENTUM THAT
WE HAVE IN THIS CASE IN TERMS OF MAKING PROGRESS AND MOVING IT
TOWARD TRIAL. I'M CONFIDENT THAT WE'LL CONTINUE TO KEEP THAT
MOMENTUM, AND THAT WE WILL ALL WORK HARD TO BE IN THE BEST
POSSIBLE POSITION TO TRY THIS CASE IN AN ORDINARILY WAY BEFORE
THE COURT WHEN WE ARE ABLE TO DO SO.

WITH RESPECT TO THESE OTHER DATES WITH THE MOTIONS, ET

CETERA, I THINK WE SHOULD DO WHAT PARTIES DO AND ONCE WE GET

SOME DIRECTION FROM THE COURT ON THE TRIAL DATE, WE SHOULD MEET

AND CONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT ABOUT THE REMAINING DATES AND

COME UP WITH A PROPOSED SCHEDULE THAT WE HOPEFULLY AGREE ON AND

1 12:06PM 12:06PM 2 3 12:06PM 12:06PM 4 12:06PM 12:06PM 6 12:06PM 7 12:06PM 8 12:06PM 9 12:06PM 10 12:06PM 11 12:06PM 12 12:06PM 13 12:07PM 14 12:07PM 15 12:07PM 16 12:07PM 17 12:07PM 18 12:07PM 19 12:07PM 20 12:07PM 21 12:07PM 22 12:07PM 23 12:07PM 24 12:07PM 25

SUBMIT IT TO THE COURT AND SET A SCHEDULE THEREAFTER.

I WILL NOTE THAT ON THE MOTIONS TO DISMISS, WE ACTUALLY THINK THAT THEY ARE ACTUALLY MORE COMPLICATED THIS TIME THAN THEY WERE LAST TIME.

WE ANTICIPATE AND WE STARTED SOME WORK ON THEM IN

ANTICIPATION THAT THIS INDICTMENT MIGHT COME, BUT WE ANTICIPATE

THAT THERE COULD BE FIVE OR SIX MOTIONS TO DISMISS.

WE HEAR THE GOVERNMENT THAT THEY WILL WANT A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITIONS TO THAT, AND OBVIOUSLY THE COURT NEEDS TIME TO CONSIDER IT.

SO WE HAVE PLENTY OF WORK TO DO IN THE MEANTIME.

YOU KNOW, THIS INDICTMENT CAME OBVIOUSLY MANY YEARS INTO
THE CASE WITH RESPECT TO EVENTS THAT HAVE BEEN, YOU KNOW, MANY,
MANY YEARS AGO AND HAVE BEEN KNOWN TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR A LONG
TIME. THEY HAVE A RIGHT TO PROCEED AS THEY HAVE, BUT IT DOES
HAVE SOME EFFECT ON GIVING US A LITTLE MORE WORK TO DO.

THE COURT HAS MENTIONED SOME DISCLOSURES THAT MIGHT

BENEFIT FROM SUPPLEMENTATION AS WELL AS A RESULT OF MAYBE

ORDERS THAT ARE GOING TO COME FROM THE COURT AND AS A RESULT OF

THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT. SO I THINK WE HAVE A LOT OF WORK

TO DO.

I THINK WE'LL BE MORE THAN BUSY ENOUGH BETWEEN NOW AND APRIL, AND I WOULD ASK THAT THE COURT CONSIDER THIS REQUEST AND BE PREPARED TO ADDRESS ANY INQUIRIES THAT THE COURT MAY HAVE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. WADE.

MR. WADE, LET ME ASK YOU, I APPRECIATE YOU RECOGNIZING THE 1 12:07PM 2 MOMENTUM AND THE MOMENTUM AND THE EFFORTS THAT BOTH SIDES AND 12:07PM YOUR TEAMS HAVE PUT IN THIS CASE. 3 12:07PM 12:07PM 4 YOU PROBABLY UNDERSTAND THE RETICENCE THAT I MIGHT HAVE TO 5 TAKE THE FOOT OFF THE GAS PEDAL. THAT JUST MAKES THE FINISH 12:08PM 12:08PM 6 LINE MORE OBSCURE AND ACTUALLY SOMETIMES INCREASES THE 12:08PM 7 DISTANCE. SO I'M CURIOUS IF WE CAN MAINTAIN MOMENTUM, IF THE COURT 12:08PM 8 WERE NOT TODAY TO DISTURB THE TRIAL DATE, LEAVE THE TRIAL DATE 12:08PM 9 12:08PM 10 IN PLACE. AND I RECOGNIZE AND WE ALL RECOGNIZE THAT THIS IS A 12:08PM 11 DYNAMIC SITUATION, BUT IF THE COURT WERE TO LEAVE THE TRIAL 12:08PM 12 DATE AS IS NOW, WHICH WOULD MANDATE THAT THE PARTIES CONTINUE 12:08PM 13 THEIR BEST EFFORTS TO CAPTURE ALL OF THE LITIGATION THAT YOU FEEL IS NECESSARY WITH THAT OCTOBER 27TH TRIAL DATE, WOULD YOU 12:08PM 14 12:08PM 15 BE ABLE TO DO THAT? MR. WADE: I THINK WE WOULD HAVE A VERY DIFFICULT 12:08PM 16 12:08PM 17 TIME WITH THE CURRENT INDICTMENT, YOUR HONOR, MOVING FORWARD IN 12:08PM 18 OCTOBER. GIVEN THAT WE HAVE GOT A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT THAT 12:08PM 19 MY GUESS IS OUR CLIENT IS ABOUT TO BE ARRAIGNED ON MAYBE IN A 12:09PM 20 FEW MINUTES HERE OR THE COURT WILL ENTER THE ORDER ON THE 12:09PM 21 WAIVER OF ARRAIGNMENT. I THINK WE WILL HAVE A VERY, VERY 12:09PM 22 DIFFICULT TIME. 12:09PM 23 WE STILL HAVE MANY OPEN ISSUES THAT THESE MOTIONS IDENTIFY 12:09PM 24 SOME OF THEM. THERE ARE MANY MORE. 12:09PM 25 WE DIDN'T BRING THEM TO THE COURT IN CONNECTION WITH THIS

1 12:09PM 2 12:09PM 3 12:09PM 12:09PM 4 12:09PM 12:09PM 12:09PM 7 12:09PM 8 12:09PM 9 12:09PM 10 12:09PM 11 12:10PM 12 12:10PM 13 12:10PM 14 12:10PM 15 12:10PM 16 12:10PM 17 12:10PM 18 12:10PM 19 12:10PM 20 12:10PM 21 12:10PM 22 12:10PM 23 12:10PM 24 12:10PM 25

PROCEEDING BECAUSE WE'RE CONTINUING TO WORK WITH THE GOVERNMENT TO TRY TO RESOLVE THEM.

BUT I DO NOT THINK EVEN WITH -- IF WE DIDN'T HAVE THE PANDEMIC, THAT WE WOULD BE READY TO PROCEED GIVEN THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IN OCTOBER.

SO WE WOULD BE BACK IN A SITUATION WHERE, AS THE COURT KNOWS, WE SUGGESTED PREVIOUSLY THAT THE APPROPRIATE DATE WOULD BE AFTER THE FIRST OF THE YEAR EVEN WITHOUT THE PANDEMIC.

SO -- AND I DON'T THINK, FRANKLY, THAT KEEPING THE DATE

AND NOT TAKING SOME RELIEF NOW IS JUST GOING TO MAKE -- PRESENT

PROBLEMS AND, FRANKLY, SOME RISK FOR ALL BECAUSE IF THAT IS THE

CASE, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO EMBARK UPON SERVING TRIAL

SUBPOENAS ALMOST IMMEDIATELY, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO EMBARK

UPON SOME OTHER TRIAL PREPARATION ACTIVITY THAT MIGHT REQUIRE

TRAVEL AND THINGS THAT, FRANKLY, WE WOULD PREFER NOT TO DO IN

THE CURRENT HEALTH ENVIRONMENT.

I RECOGNIZE THE COURT'S DESIRE TO MOVE FORWARD. I THINK
THE COURT HAS GOTTEN A SENSE OF THE CANDOR WITH WHICH WE LIKE
TO DEAL WITH THIS COURT IN EVERY ASPECT, AND I CAN TELL THE
COURT WE WILL MOVE FORWARD AGGRESSIVELY WITH RESPECT TO
EVERYTHING TO TRY TO MAKE PROGRESS AND GET THIS CASE READY.

YOU SAW MOTIONS THAT YOU REFERENCED AS MOTIONS THAT ARE
MOTION IN LIMINE LIKE. THAT WAS BECAUSE WE RECOGNIZE THAT WE
WANT TO CONTINUE TO DO WORK TO GET INTO A SITUATION WHERE THE
ISSUES ARE RIPEN SO WE CAN PRESENT THEM TO THE COURT AND WE CAN

1 12:11PM 2 12:11PM 3 12:11PM 12:11PM 4 12:11PM 12:11PM 6 12:11PM 7 12:11PM 8 12:11PM 9 12:11PM 10 12:11PM 11 12:11PM 12 12:11PM 13 12:11PM 14 12:11PM 15 12:11PM 16 12:11PM 17 12:11PM 18 12:12PM 19 12:12PM 20 12:12PM 21 12:12PM 22 12:12PM 23 12:12PM 24 12:12PM 25

BE IN THE BEST POSSIBLE POSITION TO PROCEED TO TRIAL.

BUT I DON'T THINK REALISTICALLY IN THE CURRENT HEALTH ENVIRONMENT, WHICH HAS GOTTEN WORSE IN THESE MONTHS NOT BETTER, WHERE WE HAVEN'T HAD THE ABILITY TO MEET WITH OUR CLIENT IN MONTHS IN PERSON, WHERE WE DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO MEET WITH WITNESSES, WHERE WE DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO MEET IN PERSON WITH EXPERTS.

THERE'S A LOT THAT CAN BE DONE. THERE'S A LOT THAT WE HAVE DONE, BUT WE NEED LEAD TIME IN ADVANCE TO DO THAT. IF WE'RE FORCED TO DO IT, YOUR HONOR KNOWS WE WOULD DO IT, BUT IT ENDANGERS PEOPLE, AND WE WOULD PREFER THAT WE WOULD NOT BE PUT IN THAT CHOICE.

AND WE WOULD ASK THE COURT TO NOT PUT US IN THAT CHOICE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, MR. WADE.

LET ME JUST ASK YOU ABOUT A COUPLE OF OTHER JUST TRIAL PROTOCOLS. VIDEOTAPING WITNESSES, DEPOSITION TYPE WITNESSES THAT WOULD BE PRESERVED FOR TRIAL. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU'VE THOUGHT ABOUT THAT OR WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS ARE.

ALSO, I'M CURIOUS TO KNOW WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS ARE ABOUT PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL BY VIDEO EITHER IN TOTAL OR PARTS OF IT, THAT IS, WITNESS TESTIMONY BEING CAPTURED BY A VIDEO AS OPPOSED TO IN PERSON.

I UNDERSTAND THERE ARE SOME CONFRONTATION ISSUES, CONSTITUTIONAL CONFRONTATION ISSUES THAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO SPEAK TO, BUT I'M JUST CURIOUS ABOUT YOUR THOUGHTS ON THAT.

1 12:12PM 2 12:12PM 3 12:12PM 12:12PM 4 12:12PM 5 12:12PM 6 12:12PM 7 12:12PM 8 12:13PM 9 12:13PM 10 12:13PM 11 12:13PM 12 12:13PM 13 12:13PM 14 12:13PM 15 12:13PM 16 12:13PM 17 12:13PM 18 12:13PM 19 12:13PM 20 12:13PM 21 12:13PM 22 12:13PM 23 12:13PM 24 12:14PM 25

MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, THEY'RE VERY INTERESTING
ISSUES AND RECOGNIZING THE COURT MAY RAISE THEM, I SPENT SOME
TIME INVESTIGATING AND RESEARCHING PROCEEDINGS.

THERE ARE -- OBVIOUSLY, I KNOW YOU'RE AWARE OF THE TRIAL

IN FRONT OF JUDGE ALSUP. THAT HAS PROCEEDED. THAT, OF COURSE,

WAS A TRIAL WHERE THE DEFENDANT WAS IN CUSTODY. IT WAS IN THE

MIDST OF TRIAL WHEN THE PANDEMIC STARTED, AND THE JURY WAS HELD

OVER, AND THEN THERE THE PARTIES PROCEEDED VIA CONSENT.

BUT REGARDLESS, I TOOK IT AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO WATCH THAT PROCEEDING.

I ALSO RESEARCHED. THERE WAS A JURY TRIAL IN FLORIDA THAT HAPPENED ON A PILOT BASIS IN STATE COURT WITH RESPECT TO AN INSURANCE DISPUTE AND LOOKED AT THE FEEDBACK THAT LAWYERS ON BOTH SIDES PROVIDED THERE WITH RESPECT TO THE ISSUES.

AND I THINK SUFFICE IT TO SAY I DON'T THINK THAT WE WOULD BE COMFORTABLE PROCEEDING IN THAT MANNER IN A CASE LIKE THIS GIVEN THE LIMITATIONS THAT WOULD RESULT FROM IT.

THERE ARE A NUMBER OF ISSUES AT EACH STEP OF THE TRIAL, IF
YOU CONSIDER JURY SELECTION ALL OF THE WAY THROUGH TO THE END,
BUT CONFRONTATION RIGHTS ARE AMONG THE BIGGEST ISSUES.

BUT THE REAL ISSUE, YOUR HONOR, IS WE COULDN'T DO THE WHOLE THING REMOTELY.

AND SO IT DOESN'T REALLY SOLVE -- I DON'T THINK IT SOLVES THAT MUCH ANYWAY. WE CONFERRED WITH THE GOVERNMENT A BIT ON THIS, WE HAD SOME DIALOGUE ON THESE TOPICS, AND WE DID NOT SEE

1 12:14PM 2 12:14PM 3 12:14PM 12:14PM 4 12:14PM 12:14PM 6 12:14PM 7 12:14PM 8 12:14PM 9 12:14PM 10 12:14PM 11 12:14PM 12 12:14PM 13 12:14PM 14 12:15PM 15 12:15PM 16 12:15PM 17 12:15PM 18 12:15PM 19 12:15PM 20 12:15PM 21 12:15PM 22 12:15PM 23 12:15PM 24 12:15PM 25

A WORKABLE SOLUTION IN A CASE OF THIS SIZE.

NOW, I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT'S NEVER WORKABLE. THERE COULD BE A CASE WHERE PARTIES CONSENT TO CERTAIN THINGS. THERE COULD BE A CASE WHERE OTHER RIGHTS LIKE SPEEDY TRIAL RIGHTS AND THE LIKE NEED TO BE BALANCED, BUT THIS ISN'T THAT CASE.

THIS IS A CASE WHERE WE'RE NOT ASSERTING -- DEMANDING A SPEEDY TRIAL. WE'RE WILLING TO WAIVE THAT RIGHT.

WE ARE -- OUR CLIENT IS NOT IN CUSTODY, AND THERE'S A SOLUTION TO THESE PROBLEMS. IT'S NOT ONE THAT HAS A LOT OF CURRENCY IN TODAY'S CLIMATE, BUT IT IS THERE NONETHELESS AND THAT IS A LITTLE BIT OF PATIENCE. WE THINK THAT WILL SOLVE THESE CHALLENGES.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT DELAY SOMETIMES AFFECTS WITNESS'S AVAILABILITY, EITHER THEY LEAVE THE JURISDICTION OR HAVE PLANS TO MOVE, OR IN TODAY'S WORLD I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT MEANS, BUT SOME PEOPLE ARE LEAVING THEIR CURRENT RESIDENCES FOR SAFER AREAS, AND THOSE AREAS MIGHT BE OUTSIDE OF THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT OR MIGHT PRESENT ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS FOR GETTING A WITNESS TO COME BACK TO COURTS.

SOME WITNESSES MIGHT BECOME ILL SUCH THAT THEY'RE NOT AVAILABLE FOR COURT OR SOME OTHER TERRIBLE THING MIGHT HAPPEN IF WE DELAY. YOU KNOW, DELAY BRINGS THESE TYPES OF ISSUES.

ARE THERE ANY -- IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE THAT YOU THINK THAT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE PRESERVED BY A DEPOSITION OR FOR A SPECIFIC WITNESS BECAUSE THERE MIGHT BE A QUESTION ABOUT THE WITNESS'S

AVAILABILITY IN THE FUTURE? DO WE HAVE TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT 1 12:15PM 12:16PM 2 THAT IN THIS CASE? MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, THAT CAN BE A CONCERN. 3 12:16PM 12:16PM 4 OBVIOUSLY EVEN AT TIMES WITH THE THREE OR FOUR WEEK DELAY 12:16PM 5 SOMETIMES CIRCUMSTANCES WITH WITNESSES CHANGE OR UNFORTUNATE 12:16PM 6 THINGS CAN HAPPEN TO WITNESSES. WE HAVE NOT SEEN ANY INDICATION OF THAT IN THIS CASE. 12:16PM 7 THE CIRCUMSTANCES YOU PRESENT, YOUR HONOR, WHERE PEOPLE 12:16PM 8 12:16PM 9 ARE GOING TO DIFFERENT PLACES EVEN WITHIN THE COUNTRY BECAUSE 12:16PM 10 OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES ACTUALLY IS ONE OF THE CHALLENGES WITH 12:16PM 11 PROCEEDING TO TRIAL IN THIS ENVIRONMENT BECAUSE IT'S HARD TO 12:16PM 12 LOCATE PEOPLE. IT'S HARD TO LOCATE WITNESSES RIGHT NOW. 12:16PM 13 SO CERTAINLY IF THE GOVERNMENT WERE TO THINK THAT WAS AN 12:16PM 14 ISSUE AND THOUGHT THERE WAS A NEED TO PRESERVE TESTIMONY, THE 12:16PM 15 GOVERNMENT COULD RAISE THAT ISSUE WITH US AND WE COULD MEET AND CONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND CONSIDER THEIR REQUEST AND 12:16PM 16 WHETHER WE WOULD CONSENT TO IT. 12:16PM 17 12:16PM 18 WE DON'T PRESENTLY SEE THE NEED ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLMES TO 12:17PM 19 PRESERVE ANY TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME. 12:17PM 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'M CURIOUS. DO YOU HAVE 12:17PM 21 THE WITNESS LIST, THE GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS LIST? MR. WADE: I DO. 12:17PM 22 12:17PM 23 THE COURT: AND I'LL TURN THIS TO MR. LEACH. THIS 12:17PM 24 IS A QUESTION FOR HIM BECAUSE I'M JUST CURIOUS, MR. LEACH, 12:17PM 25 WHETHER YOU HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT ANY WITNESS'S AVAILABILITY

1 12:17PM 2 12:17PM 3 12:17PM 12:17PM 4 12:17PM 5 12:17PM 6 12:17PM 7 12:17PM 8 12:17PM 9 12:18PM 10 12:18PM 11 12:18PM 12 12:18PM 13 12:18PM 14 12:18PM 15 12:18PM 16 12:18PM 17 12:18PM 18 12:18PM 19 12:18PM 20 12:18PM 21 12:18PM 22 12:18PM 23 12:18PM 24 12:19PM 25

EITHER BECAUSE OF GEOGRAPHIC REASONS OR PERHAPS HEALTH REASONS OR OTHER REASONS THAT MIGHT PRESENT?

MR. LEACH: YES. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

IF I COULD RESPOND BRIEFLY TO SOME OF THE THINGS THAT MR. WADE IS RAISING BECAUSE I AGREE WITH MANY OF THE CHALLENGES MR. WADE IS PRESENTING.

BUT IN TERMS OF PRESERVING WITNESS TESTIMONY, I THINK IT'S A SMALL MINORITY OF WITNESSES THAT WOULD FALL INTO THE CATEGORY THAT THE COURT IS DESCRIBING. I THINK THERE ARE SOME WITNESSES WHO ARE OVER THE AGE OF 65 WHERE I DON'T HAVE ANY CURRENT REASON TO THINK THAT THEY WOULD BE UNAVAILABLE ON A PARTICULAR DATE, BUT IT'S SOMETHING THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS GIVING THOUGHT TO, BUT IT'S A SMALL NUMBER OF WITNESSES AND I DON'T THINK WOULD EXPEDITE THE TRIAL OR PRESENT SOME SPECIAL NEED FOR ONE DATE VERSUS ANOTHER.

AND CERTAINLY TO THE EXTENT THAT WE CAN REACH AGREEMENT WITH COUNSEL ON THAT, I THINK IT WOULD MEET THE STANDARD FOR A RULE 15 DEPOSITION, BUT I THINK FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE THAT'S A SMALL CATEGORY OF WITNESSES AND IT RELATES MORE TO AGE THAN IT DOES TO A CONCERN THAT A WITNESS WOULD NOT BE IN A JURISDICTION WHERE WE COULD COMPEL THEIR ATTENDANCE WITH THE COURT.

MORE BROADLY, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO EMPHASIZE I AGREE WITH SOME OF THE THINGS THAT MR. WADE IS SAYING. I THINK THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE FOR THE TRIAL CAN BE DONE BETWEEN

1 12:19PM 2 12:19PM 3 12:19PM 12:19PM 4 12:19PM 12:19PM 6 12:19PM 7 12:19PM 8 12:19PM 9 12:19PM 10 12:19PM 11 12:19PM 12 12:20PM 13 12:20PM 14 12:20PM 15 12:20PM 16 12:20PM 17 12:20PM 18 12:20PM 19 12:20PM 20 12:20PM 21 12:20PM 22 12:20PM 23 12:20PM 24 12:20PM 25

NOW AND OCTOBER 28TH, BUT I WOULD PUSH BACK ON THE SOLUTION OF KEEPING THAT DATE WITH AN EYE TOWARDS IT IS JUST GOING TO BE MOVED. I THINK THAT'S WORSE FOR ALL OF THE PARTIES.

FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE, WE'RE READY TO GO, AND IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THIS CASE GO EXPEDITIOUSLY. THE FRAUD HERE IS IN THE HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. THERE ARE NUMEROUS VICTIMS ON THE PATIENT SIDE AND ON THE INVESTOR SIDE.

SO WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT IT GO EXPEDITIOUSLY.

BUT MANY OF THE CHALLENGES THAT MR. WADE IS MENTIONING ARE REAL CHALLENGES AND UNIQUE CHALLENGES TO THIS CASE.

FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE AT LEAST 16 OF OUR WITNESSES ARE OVER THE AGE OF 65, WHICH IS ONE OF THE COVID RISK FACTORS. A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE WITNESSES, AS MR. WADE POINTS OUT, ARE FROM OUT OF TOWN. MANY OF THE WITNESSES ARE IN HOT SPOTS LIKE PHOENIX, TEXAS, AND FLORIDA, AND THE LENGTH OF THE TRIAL, I'M HOPEFUL TO BRING IT IN SHORTER THAN THE ESTIMATE THAT MR. WADE GAVE, BUT IT'S GOING TO BE LONGER THAN YOUR REGULAR TRIAL. AND THOSE ARE REAL CHALLENGES, AND WE AGREE THAT THOSE SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT BY THE COURT.

I DO THINK APRIL OF 2021 IS TOO LONG. THAT'S NINE MONTHS AWAY. THAT'S A LONG TIME, AND FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE, WE DON'T WANT TO RETAIN A DATE THAT WE DON'T THINK IS GOING TO STICK.

WE THINK IF THE COURT IS INCLINED TO MOVE THE TRIAL, IT SHOULD MOVE THE TRIAL TO FEBRUARY OF 2021 AND HAVE

1 12:20PM 2 12:21PM 3 12:21PM 12:21PM 4 12:21PM 12:21PM 6 12:21PM 7 12:21PM 8 12:21PM 9 12:21PM 10 12:21PM 11 12:21PM 12 12:21PM 13 12:21PM 14 12:22PM 15 12:22PM 16 12:22PM 17 12:22PM 18 12:22PM 19 12:22PM 20 12:22PM 21 12:22PM 22 12:22PM 23 12:22PM 24 12:22PM 25

MR. BALWANI'S TRIAL FOLLOW SHORTLY AFTER THAT IN MAY OF 2021.

BUT IF THERE'S A REQUEST TO CONTINUE THE TRIAL, AND THAT'S WHAT I HEARD FROM MR. WADE, I THINK IT'S INCUMBENT UPON ALL OF US TO TAKE THOSE CHALLENGES INTO ACCOUNT. THE GOVERNMENT IS READY TO GO AND WILL GO ON WHATEVER DATE THE COURT SETS, BUT IT SHOULD BE A REAL DATE, AND IT SHOULD BE A DATE WE'RE ALL GOING TO HOLD. AND IF THERE'S DOUBT ABOUT OCTOBER 27TH, I THINK THE PRUDENT THING IS TO SET THE DATE WE ALL THINK THAT WE CAN MEET, AND WE THINK IT'S EARLIER THAN APRIL.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. LEACH.

LET ME JUST SAY, I APPRECIATE ALL OF YOUR CANDOR HERE. WE ALL ARE OF COMMON PURPOSE AND THAT IS TO GET THIS TRIAL ENGAGED AS SOON AS IT'S READY TO BE ENGAGED AND ENGAGED SUCH THAT THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS ARE PROTECTED, SHE AND HE, MR. BALWANI, RECEIVE A FAIR TRIAL, AND THE GOVERNMENT, AND THEY RECEIVE A FAIR TRIAL AND THAT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY APPROPRIATE.

THE COVID CRISIS HAS CERTAINLY INTERRUPTED THAT. LET ME SAY THAT THIS TRIAL IS A VERY, AS MR. LEACH POINTS OUT AND MR. WADE POINTS OUT, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO YOUR CLIENT, MR. WADE, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO THE INTEGRITY OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND THE VICTIMS AS MR. LEACH TELLS US, BUT THE OVERLAY ON TOP OF ALL OF THIS, OF COURSE, IS THE PANDEMIC THAT HAS HIT OUR COUNTRY.

AND I'M SURE REGRETTABLY NOW MOST PEOPLE KNOW SOMEBODY WHO HAS PERSONAL CONTACT OR AT LEAST KNOWS SOMEBODY WHO HAS

1 12:22PM 2 12:22PM 3 12:22PM 12:23PM 4 12:23PM 12:23PM 6 12:23PM 7 12:23PM 8 12:23PM 9 12:23PM 10 12:23PM 11 12:23PM 12 12:23PM 13 12:23PM 14 12:23PM 15 12:23PM 16 12:23PM 17 12:23PM 18 12:23PM 19 12:23PM 20 12:24PM 21 12:24PM 22 12:24PM 23 12:24PM 24 12:24PM 25

REGRETTABLY HAD THE VIRUS, RECOVERED, AND SOME OF US REGRETTABLY MAY KNOW FOLKS WHO ARE NO LONGER WITH US BECAUSE OF THAT VIRUS. SO IT'S A REAL SHADOW THAT LOOMS OVER THE WORK THAT WE DO, IT LOOMS OVER THE COUNTRY THAT WE LOVE, AND WE ALL ARE TRYING TO DO OUR PART TO MAKE SURE THAT THE VIRUS DOESN'T SPREAD AND PROTECT OUR FAMILIES AND LOVED ONES, OUR NEIGHBORS, AND OUR COMMUNITIES. THAT'S REALLY OUR RESPONSIBILITY, ISN'T IT, TO OURSELVES AND TO OUR COMMUNITIES TO PROTECT OURSELVES IN THAT WAY.

THAT RESPONSIBILITY IS NOT LOST ON ME. AND I APPRECIATE THE CANDOR OF MR. WADE, MR. LEACH, AND YOUR TEAMS BECAUSE I KNOW YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THIS WITH ALL OF YOUR TEAMS, HOW BEST TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC, HOW TO PROTECT YOU, TO PROTECT MY STAFF, THANK YOU FOR RECOGNIZING THAT.

I'M IN THE COURTHOUSE NOW, AND I'M SITTING IN THE CEREMONIAL COURTROOM ALONE. I'M HERE BY WAY OF A LAPTOP, AND MY STAFF ARE REMOTE. I HAVE STAFF DOWN THE HALL IN MY CHAMBERS, BUT I SIT HERE ALONE.

AND I LOOK OUT AND I TRY TO ENVISION WHAT A JURY TRIAL FOR 3 MONTHS WOULD LOOK LIKE HERE WITH POTENTIALLY MAYBE WE'LL HAVE 17 JURORS, WON'T WE, 12 JURORS AND MAYBE 5 ALTERNATES. WE MIGHT NEED MORE ALTERNATES FOR A CASE LIKE THIS IF IT'S TRIED CONCURRENT WITH THE PANDEMIC. AND I LOOK OUT AND I TRY TO ENVISION HOW AND WHERE PEOPLE WOULD SIT. I TRY TO ENVISION WHERE THE JURY WOULD SIT SUCH THAT THEY CAN OBSERVE A WITNESS

12:	24PM	1
12:	24PM	2
12:	24PM	3
12:	24PM	4
12:	24PM	5
12:	24PM	6
12:	24PM	7
12:	24PM	8
12:	25PM	9
12:	25PM	10
12:	25PM	11
12:	25PM	12
12:	25PM	13
12:	25PM	14
12:	25PM	15
12:	25PM	16
12:	25PM	17
12:	25PM	18
12:	25PM	19
12:	25PM	20
12:	25PM	21
12:	25PM	22
12:	26PM	23
12:	26PM	24
12:	26PM	25

TO MY LEFT HERE IN THIS COURTROOM AND CAPTURE AND MAKE THEIR DETERMINATIONS AS TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THAT PARTICULAR WITNESS WHEN THEY SIT IN, CONTINUING WITH THE BASEBALL ANALOGY, WITH THE CHEAP SEATS AND THEY'RE IN THE CORNER AS OPPOSED TO THE JURY BOX CLOSER TO THE WITNESS.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RAMIFICATION OF THAT. HOW DOES THE JUDGE, HOW DOES SHE KEEP TRACK OF ALL OF THE JURORS IN THE COURTROOM AND THEY'RE ALL FOLLOWING EVERYTHING THAT SHE EXPECTS THEM TO FOLLOW IN A COURTROOM?

IT CREATES -- THOSE ARE IS JUST SOME OF THE PROTOCOL CHALLENGES OF RUNNING THE COURT. BUT AGAIN, IT ALL GETS BACK TO SOMETHING THAT YOU ALL AGREE IN AND THAT IS THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF OUR COMMUNITY.

I HAVE GREAT RETICENCE TO SUMMON MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY AND INVITE THEM TO SIT IN CONFINED AREAS FOR LENGTHY PERIODS OF TIME WHEN THERE IS A PANDEMIC THAT AFFECTS THEM, THEIR FAMILIES, AND WE HAVE NO VACCINE AS OF YET AND I KNOW PEOPLE ARE WORKING HARD ON THAT AS WELL.

SO THAT'S A GREAT CONCERN OF MINE. I APPRECIATE YOU RECOGNIZING THAT AS I THINK WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT PREVIOUSLY THE OCTOBER DATE MIGHT BE A LITTLE TOO AMBITIOUS FOR US.

BUT THEN WHAT DO WE DO NEXT? IDEALLY -- AND THIS IS ME SPEAKING SELFISHLY AS A JUDGE, IDEALLY WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS ALL OF THE WORK GETS DONE. BUT IF WE FINISH THAT WORK, IF IT'S OCTOBER, IF IT'S NOVEMBER, IF IT'S DECEMBER, SOME TIME THIS

1 12:26PM 2 12:26PM 3 12:26PM 12:26PM 4 12:26PM 12:26PM 6 12:26PM 7 12:26PM 8 12:26PM 9 12:26PM 10 12:26PM 11 12:26PM 12 12:26PM 13 12:27PM 14 12:27PM 15 12:27PM 16 12:27PM 17 12:27PM 18 12:27PM 19 12:27PM 20 12:27PM 21 12:27PM 22 12:27PM 23 12:27PM 24 12:27PM 25

YEAR, AND THEN WHAT WE'RE DOING THEN IS THAT WE'RE WAITING,
WE'RE WAITING FOR THE SAFE TIME. WE'RE NOT WAITING FOR WORK TO
BE DONE BECAUSE THE WORK WOULD ALREADY BE DONE. ALL WE'RE
WAITING FOR NEXT IS WHEN IS IT SAFE? WHEN IS IT SAFE TO HAVE
THE COMMUNITY COME IN AND HEAR THIS CASE AND MAKE THE
COMMUNITY'S DECISION ABOUT THIS CASE?

THAT'S THE IDEAL SITUATION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO PLACE

OURSELVES IN. I'D LIKE TO ACCOMPLISH THAT, THAT IS, COMPLETE

EVERYTHING THAT NEEDS TO GET DONE.

ONE WAY TO DO THAT IN A TIMELY MANNER IS, AS I'VE
SUGGESTED TO I THINK MR. LEACH, MAYBE I'LL HAVE THE DEFENSE
FILE ALL OF THEIR MOTIONS BY NOT NOON TOMORROW BUT 5:00 P.M.
TOMORROW JUST TO GIVE THEM EXTRA TIME TO GET IT ALL DONE. WE
CAN MOVE FORWARD IN SOME SCHEDULE LIKE THAT, BUT I'D LIKE TO
ENGAGE A SCHEDULE THAT IS REALISTIC.

AND I KNOW THAT TRIALS ARE DYNAMIC ALSO, PARTICULARLY
PRETRIAL. WE DON'T KNOW WHAT ELSE MAY COME UP. WE'VE HEARD
THAT THERE MIGHT BE FIVE MOTIONS AS TO THE SUPERSEDING
INDICTMENT. AND I KNOW THAT BRINGS GREAT JOY FOR MR. LEACH AND
HIS TEAM TO HEAR, BUT THERE COULD BE EXTENSIVE LITIGATION
COMING FORWARD ON THIS.

SO THAT INFORMS THE COURT ALSO THAT I NEED TO SET A SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROPRIATE IN THIS CASE.

LET ME -- I DO WANT TO TURN TO MR. COOPERSMITH AND GIVE
YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD ON THIS, SIR. ALTHOUGH I WILL

1 12:27PM 12:27PM 2 3 12:27PM 12:28PM 4 12:28PM 12:28PM 6 12:28PM 7 12:28PM 8 12:28PM 9 12:28PM 10 12:28PM 11 12:28PM 12 12:28PM 13 12:28PM 14 12:28PM 15 12:28PM 16 12:28PM 17 12:28PM 18 12:28PM 19 12:28PM 20 12:28PM 21 12:28PM 22 12:29PM 23 12:29PM 24

12:29PM 25

TELL YOU ONE THING THAT WE'LL NOT -- I'M NOT GOING TO DISTURB
IS THE FACT THAT YOUR CASE, SIR, WILL TRAIL MS. HOLMES'S CASE.
SO WHATEVER I DECIDE AS TO MS. HOLMES, YOU'LL BE THE SECONDARY
AS FAR AS TRIAL DATES AS TO THAT. THE SUGGESTION I THINK FROM
THE GOVERNMENT IS THAT ABOUT A THREE MONTH SCHEDULE AFTER THE
TRIAL OF MS. HOLMES.

BUT, MR. COOPERSMITH, WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WOULD LIKE ME TO KNOW?

MR. COOPERSMITH: THANK YOU. SO ON THE ISSUE OF TRIAL, I DO UNDERSTAND THE COURT'S RULING. WE'LL PRESERVE OUR POSITION FOR THE RECORD THAT WE BELIEVE OUR TRIAL SHOULD HAVE GONE FIRST, BUT I WON'T SAY ANY MORE ON THAT. BUT I DO UNDERSTAND AND RESPECT THE COURT'S RULING.

WITH REGARD TO THE TRIAL DATE, I UNDERSTAND THAT WE HAVE A STATUS CONFERENCE ON AUGUST 31ST I BELIEVE IT'S SCHEDULED. SO I'M SURE IF THAT STANDS WE'LL BE TALKING MORE ABOUT THAT THEN.

FOR NOW, YOUR HONOR, UNFORTUNATELY EVERYTHING THAT

MR. WADE SAID AND MR. LEACH SAID ABOUT THE COVID CRISIS AND

YOUR HONOR SAID IS RIGHT. WE'RE SORT OF AT THE MERCY OF THOSE

UNFORTUNATE CIRCUMSTANCES.

WE WOULD LIKE TO GET THIS CASE TRIED, TOO. MR. BALWANI
HAS BEEN LIVING WITH THIS INVESTIGATION SINCE 2016. HE'S BEEN
LIVING WITH THE INDICTMENT SINCE 2018. IT'S VERY UNFORTUNATE
THAT THERE'S SUCH A DELAY IN JUSTICE.

BUT THAT SAID, WE, I THINK, UNFORTUNATELY ARE GOING TO

1 12:29PM 2 12:29PM 3 12:29PM 12:29PM 4 12:29PM 12:29PM 6 12:29PM 7 12:29PM 8 12:29PM 9 12:29PM 10 12:29PM 11 12:29PM 12 12:29PM 13 12:29PM 14 12:30PM 15 12:30PM 16 12:30PM 17 12:30PM 18 12:30PM 19 12:30PM 20 12:30PM 21 12:30PM 22 12:30PM 23 12:30PM 24 12:30PM 25

HAVE TO, GIVEN THE COURT'S POSITION OF THE ORDER OF TRIAL,

AWAIT MS. HOLMES'S TRIAL. IF THE TRIAL REALLY TAKES THREE

MONTHS, THEN WE'LL HAVE TO TRY THAT AT SOME POINT, AND WE'RE

HAPPY TO RECONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT ONCE THE HOLMES TRIAL IS

SET ON WHAT EXACTLY THE SCHEDULE FOR MR. BALWANI SHOULD LOOK

LIKE AND TALK ABOUT THAT WITH THE COURT MORE ON AUGUST 31ST IF

THAT WORKS FOR YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, MR. COOPERSMITH.

I APPRECIATE THAT.

ANYONE ELSE FROM YOUR TEAM WISH TO BE HEARD?

MR. COOPERSMITH: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I SEE NO HANDS. ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

SO LET'S TALK THEN ABOUT AUGUST 31ST IS A STATUS DATE FOR

MR. BALWANI. I'M CURIOUS IF I SHOULD NOW HAVE MS. HOLMES'S

TEAM AND ALL YOU MEET AND CONFER ABOUT -- I APPRECIATE YOU

GIVING ME THESE PARTICULAR DATES HERE.

IN LIGHT OF THE -- MS. HOLMES'S SUGGESTION ABOUT

ADDITIONAL LITIGATION, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, TO THE EXTENT THAT

YOU CAN, MR. WADE, AND I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO DISCLOSE ANYTHING

THAT DISRUPT YOUR DEFENSE SCHEDULE OR ASK YOU TO TELL US WHAT

YOUR DEFENSE IS, ANYTHING LIKE THAT, BUT I THINK IT IS

APPROPRIATE FOR ME TO ASK YOU TO, NOT JUST TODAY TO RESPOND,

BUT TO ASK YOU TO INFORM THE COURT AS TO POTENTIAL MOTIONS THAT

YOU MIGHT HAVE AND FILE SUCH THAT THE GOVERNMENT CAN BE AWARE

ALSO SO WE CAN ENGAGE A REALISTIC SCHEDULE FOR LITIGATING AND

1 12:30PM 2 12:30PM 3 12:30PM 12:31PM 4 12:31PM 12:31PM 6 12:31PM 7 12:31PM 8 12:31PM 9 12:31PM 10 12:31PM 11 12:31PM 12 12:31PM 13 12:31PM 14 12:31PM 15 12:31PM 16 12:31PM 17 12:31PM 18 12:32PM 19 12:32PM 20 12:32PM 21 12:32PM 22 12:32PM 23 12:32PM 24 12:32PM 25

HEARING THOSE MOTIONS SUCH THAT I CAN THEN BE MORE INFORMED TO GIVE US A BETTER DATE FOR TRIAL WHENEVER THAT IS.

ONE THING I'M CONCERNING DOING NOW IS NOT DISTURBING THE TRIAL DATE, AND THAT IS PRIMARILY JUST TO KEEP OUR EXCLUSION OF TIME IN EFFECT, BUT NOT DISTURBING ANY OF THE TRIAL DATES, HOWEVER, SCHEDULE A STATUS CONFERENCE AGAIN AT SOME POINT. IT MIGHT BE AUGUST 31ST. IT MIGHT BE BEFORE THAT.

BUT I'D LIKE THE PARTIES TO MEET AND CONFER TO DISCUSS ANOTHER, AND I'VE USED THIS PHRASE BEFORE IN THIS CASE, A REALISTIC SCHEDULE FOR MOTIONS.

NOW, I'D LIKE -- THE ADDITIONAL MOTIONS THAT YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT ARE IMPORTANT ONES. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER OR NOT, AND I'D LIKE YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THOSE WOULD DISTURB ANY OF THE OTHER DECISIONS THAT THE COURT HAS MADE ON ANY EVIDENCE, NOT THAT WE'VE MADE MUCH, BUT I DON'T WANT TO, IF THE CASE IS CONTINUED INTO NEXT YEAR, I DON'T WANT TO START A COMPLETELY NEW SCHEDULE SUCH THAT WE LOSE ANY OF THE MOMENTUM THAT WE'VE CAPTURED, ANY OF THE WORK THAT YOU'VE DONE AND WE START OVER AGAIN. THAT DOESN'T ACCOMPLISH ANYTHING. I'M NOT INTERESTED IN THAT.

MR. WADE: NO. WE AGREE, YOUR HONOR. WE AGREE.

IF I COULD BE HEARD BRIEFLY ON YOUR COMMENTS?

THE COURT: SURE.

MR. WADE: WE DON'T INTEND TO FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGE
THINGS. WE INTEND TO CONTINUE TO MOVE FORWARD. THE GOVERNMENT

1 12:32PM 12:32PM 2 3 12:32PM 12:32PM 4 12:32PM 5 12:32PM 6 12:32PM 7 12:32PM 8 12:32PM 9 12:33PM 10 12:33PM 11 12:33PM 12 12:33PM 13 12:33PM 14 12:33PM 15 12:33PM 16 12:33PM 17 12:33PM 18 12:33PM 19 12:33PM 20 12:33PM 21 12:33PM 22 12:33PM 23 12:34PM 24 12:34PM 25

HAS EXPANDED THE SCOPE OF THE CASE, AND THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT FLOW FROM THAT, AS WE TALKED ABOUT FOR MUCH OF THE ARGUMENT TODAY. OBVIOUSLY THOSE ARE THINGS THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO DEAL WITH.

WITH RESPECT TO THE MOTIONS, WE STARTED THE WORK ON THAT
IN ANTICIPATION OF THIS, BUT OBVIOUSLY THERE IS MORE WORK TO BE
DONE. WE DO THINK THAT ONE MOTION AT LEAST SORT OF AS A MATTER
OF RECORD WOULD NEED TO REPRISE PRIOR MOTIONS TO MAKE SURE THAT
OUR PRIOR ARGUMENTS APPLY TO THE NEW INDICTMENT AND THE PRIOR
RULING APPLIES TO THE NEW INDICTMENT TO THE EXTENT THAT THE NEW
INDICTMENT DOESN'T CHANGE THE NATURE OF THAT RULING.

AND THEN WE THINK THERE ARE SEVERAL ADDITIONAL MOTIONS,

FOUR OR FIVE DIFFERENT MOTIONS TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT. YOUR

HONOR HAS HEARD ABOUT SOME OF THEM TODAY. OBVIOUSLY, THERE'S A

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS MOTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN COUNTS,

THERE WILL BE A NOTICE RELATED MOTION AND A FEW OTHER THINGS.

I THINK WHILE WE TRIED TO PREPARE, OUR ANTICIPATION WOULD
BE THAT OUR HOPE IS WE GET THOSE IN FRONT OF THE COURT
REASONABLY QUICKLY AND FIND A TIME WHEN THAT IS DONE AND THE
GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF TIME TO RESPOND,
BUT I WOULD GUESS THAT WITHIN A MONTH WE COULD GET ALL OF THOSE
MOTIONS ON FILE.

I THINK I HEARD MR. LEACH SAY HE WAS LOOKING FOR

THREE WEEKS. HE MAY WANT A MONTH. I DON'T -- I WANT TO BE

FAIR TO THE GOVERNMENT HONESTLY. AND FUNDAMENTALLY, I WANT TO

1 12:34PM 12:34PM 2 3 12:34PM 12:34PM 4 12:34PM 5 12:34PM 6 12:34PM 7 12:34PM 8 12:34PM 9 12:34PM 10 12:34PM 11 12:34PM 12 12:34PM 13 12:34PM 14 12:34PM 15 12:35PM 16 12:35PM 17 12:35PM 18 12:35PM 19 12:35PM 20 12:35PM 21 12:35PM 22 12:35PM 23 12:35PM 24 12:35PM 25

ACT CONSISTENT WITH THE DIRECTION PROVIDED BY THE COURT.

FRANKLY, WHILE WE ALWAYS ADHERE TO IT, I'M NOT SURE WE NEED IT

HERE. WE WANT TO MOVE THIS FORWARD. WE SHARE THAT DESIRE, BUT

WE SHARE THE CONCERNS THAT THE COURT -- THAT WE DISCUSSED

BEFORE AND THAT THE COURT IDENTIFIED.

SO I THINK IF MORE BROADLY WE WERE TO MEET AND CONFER,
RECOGNIZING THE COURT HASN'T FORMALLY MOVED THE TRIAL DATE BUT
IS INCLINED TO AFTER HEARING FROM THE COURT, FROM THE PARTIES
ON THE PARTICULARS, WE CAN CERTAINLY MEET AND CONFER WITH THE
GOVERNMENT AND FIND A TIME TO COME BACK IN FRONT OF THE COURT
IF NEED BE, OR IT MAY BE THAT WE CAN JUST AGREE TO A SCHEDULE
AND THE COURT CAN ORDER IT. WHATEVER THE COURT THINKS WILL
MAKE SENSE. BUT WE CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT WITHIN A WEEK OR TWO
I WOULD THINK IF THAT IS OF BENEFIT TO THE COURT.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

MR. LEACH.

MR. LEACH: WE CERTAINLY CAN WORK WITH DEFENSE COUNSEL ON AN APPROPRIATE SCHEDULE WITH THE OCTOBER DATE IN MIND, YOUR HONOR.

I NEED TO EMPHASIZE, THOUGH, MUCH OF THE WORK FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE GOING FORWARD IS MEETING WITH WITNESSES WHO WE HAVE SUBPOENAED, WHO WE HAVE TOLD BE READY IN OCTOBER WHO ARE HOLDING THAT TIME AND WHO ARE MAKING SUBSTANTIAL SACRIFICES IN ORDER TO, A, MEET WITH US, AND ALSO HOLD THAT TIME FROM THEIR SCHEDULE.

1 12:35PM 2 12:35PM 3 12:35PM 12:35PM 4 12:35PM 12:35PM 6 12:35PM 7 12:36PM 8 12:36PM 9 12:36PM 10 12:36PM 11 12:36PM 12 12:36PM 13 12:36PM 14 12:36PM 15 12:36PM 16 12:36PM 17 12:36PM 18 12:36PM 19 12:36PM 20 12:36PM 21 12:36PM 22 12:36PM 23 12:36PM 24 12:37PM 25

AND SO IT'S NOT -- FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE, IT'S DIFFICULT TO TURN THOSE THINGS ON A DIME. AND IF -- AS I'VE SAID IN MY EARLIER REMARKS, HOLDING A DATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOLDING A DATE POSES SOME GREAT DIFFICULTIES TO US IF EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN.

SO I THINK THE PRUDENT THING WE COULD DO IS SET THE SCHEDULE, WE CAN LITIGATE WHATEVER WE NEED TO LITIGATE THROUGH THAT, AND THEN HAVE THAT DATE CERTAIN IN MIND AND STICK TO IT. WE WOULD URGE THE COURT TO DO THAT, BUT WHATEVER DATE SET WE WILL MEET. THE GOVERNMENT WILL BE READY.

THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU. I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY, MR. LEACH, AND I RECOGNIZE THE ISSUE THAT YOU HAVE TOLD YOUR CLIENTS -- EXCUSE ME, YOUR WITNESSES THAT THERE'S A DATE CERTAIN AND THE JUDGE WAS FIRM ON THAT, AND I WAS, AND COVID INTERRUPTED IT. I SUPPOSE THAT'S MY EXCUSE. BUT YOU CAN CERTAINLY POINT THE FINGER BACK TO THE JUDGE, AND I INVITE YOU TO DO THAT.

TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU NEED SOME RELIEF FROM THAT, YOU SHOULD RECOGNIZE -- LET ME JUST SAY THAT I INDICATED I WOULD LEAVE THE DATE. I'M NOT GOING TO DISTURB THE CURRENT TRIAL DATE. I'M DOING THAT TO, AS I SAID, TO KEEP THE TIME EXCLUSIONS IN PLACE AND ALL OF THE OTHER ISSUES REGARDING THAT IN PLACE.

WHAT I WILL TELL YOU IS THAT IT IS UNREALISTIC THAT WE ARE GOING TO GO TO TRIAL ON THAT DATE. IT'S JUST NOT GOING TO

HAPPEN.

SO IF THAT RELIEVES YOU FROM THOSE APPOINTMENTS YOU HAVE WITH WITNESSES, I HOPE THAT GIVES YOU AND THEM SOME REASSURANCE THAT THEY WON'T BE NEEDED FOR THAT TRIAL DATE.

THEN THEY'LL ASK YOU, OKAY, WHEN SHOULD WE RESCHEDULE?

WHEN IS THE NEW DATE? THAT'S THE DATE THEN, AND I HEARD YOU

ALL TELL ME YOUR OPINIONS, THE APRIL AND THE FEBRUARY DATE. I

WOULD LIKE YOU TO GIVE ME SOME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT WORK

THAT YOU WILL DO BETWEEN NOW AND THE EARLIER OF THOSE TRIAL

DATES BEING FEBRUARY, WHAT YOUR SCHEDULE IS GOING TO BE TO

ACCOMPLISH ALL OF THE MOTION PRACTICE THAT IS GOING TO BE

NEEDED ON THE CHARGING DOCUMENT.

MY SENSE IS WHAT -- AS I SAID, WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE

DONE, AND MY WISH LIST IS THAT WE HAVE ALL OF THE LITIGATION

AND THE PRETRIAL LITIGATION AS TO CHARGING DOCUMENTS AND IF IT

SURVIVES THAT, THERE IS A CASE THAT GOES FORWARD, WHATEVER THAT

CASE IS, IT GOES FORWARD SUCH THAT ALL OF YOUR WITNESS

PRODUCTION IS DONE. OF COURSE WE'VE TALKED ABOUT OTHER

EXAMINATIONS THAT NEED TO BE ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT HAS TO -
THAT SCHEDULING SHOULD GO FORWARD AS WELL AND ACCOMPLISH ALL OF

THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE THERE.

SO I'D LIKE YOU TO MEET AND CONFER AND TALK ABOUT ALL OF
THOSE THINGS THAT YOU NEED TO ACCOMPLISH VIS-A-VIS AN EARLIER
TRIAL DATE. I HEARD THE GOVERNMENT SAY FEBRUARY. YOU MIGHT
WANT TO LOOK AT THAT DATE, THE EARLIER OF THOSE DATES, THAT IS,

1 12:38PM 2 12:38PM 3 12:38PM 12:38PM 4 12:38PM 12:38PM 6 12:39PM 7 12:39PM 8 12:39PM 9 12:39PM 10 12:39PM 11 12:39PM 12 12:39PM 13 12:39PM 14 12:39PM 15 12:39PM 16 12:39PM 17 12:39PM 18 12:39PM 19 12:39PM 20 12:39PM 21 12:39PM 22 12:39PM 23 12:40PM 24 12:40PM 25

THE FEBRUARY DATE AS OPPOSED TO THE APRIL, AND LOOK AND SEE IF
THINGS CAN BE DONE BY FEBRUARY? DO YOU NEED TO GO INTO MARCH?
DOES IT REALLY REQUIRE AN APRIL DATE?

ALL OF THIS, OF COURSE, IS GOING TO BE GUIDED, ISN'T IT,

BY THE CLOUD OF COVID? I HOPE THESE GOOD SCIENTISTS, WHEREVER

THEY'RE WORKING, I HOPE THEY'RE ABLE TO FIND A VACCINE FOR ALL

OF US. THAT WOULD BE A MIRACLE, AND IT WOULD BE WELL RECEIVED

BY THE PLANET.

BUT WE NEED TO -- IT'S SUCH A DYNAMIC CIRCUMSTANCE, WE

NEED TO PREPARE FOR THE FACT THAT THERE IS THE SECOND WAVE.

AND I HEARD THIS MORNING ON THE RADIO COMING IN WHEN DOES THE

SECOND WAVE START IF WE'RE STILL IN A FIRST WAVE IN DECEMBER IN

THE MIDDLE OF THE INFLUENZA SEASON? WE JUST DON'T KNOW THOSE

THINGS, WE JUST DON'T. SO IT IS DYNAMIC IN THAT REGARD.

I'M HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN GET THE CASE TRIED IN Q1 OF NEXT YEAR. THAT WOULD BE MY GOAL. I THINK IT'S YOURS AS WELL.

BUT WHAT THAT EXACT DATE IS, I DON'T HAVE COMPLETE INFORMATION TO SET THAT DATE TODAY.

I APPRECIATE YOUR OFFERS OF THESE DATES, AND THEY MIGHT BE GOOD ONES, AND IT MIGHT BE -- IT MAY BE THAT THE APRIL DATE IS THE ONE, SINCE WE'VE SELECTED IT FOR MR. BALWANI, IT MIGHT BE EASY TO JUST SLIDE IN AND USE THAT.

BUT I APPRECIATE THE GOVERNMENT'S DESIRE TO GET THE CASE

MOVING AND THEIR THOUGHT THAT WE CAN GET IT PERHAPS GOING

BEFORE THEN RECOGNIZING THAT IN FEBRUARY WE WOULD HAVE TO SET

OUR OR WE WOULD LIKE TO SET OUR FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE THAT 1 12:40PM WOULD BE SOME TIME IN JANUARY. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THAT ABOUT 2 12:40PM THREE OR FOUR WEEKS IN ADVANCE OF THE TRIAL DATE. 3 12:40PM 12:40PM 4 HERE WE MIGHT WANT TO DO IT A LITTLE MORE THAN THAT, JUST BECAUSE I THINK, AS WE EXPERIENCED TODAY, THE MOTIONS IN LIMINE 12:40PM 12:40PM 6 WILL PROBABLY BE EXTENSIVE. I'M JUST GUESSING, BUT I THINK 12:40PM 7 IT'S AN EDUCATED GUESS THAT WE'LL PROBABLY HAVE EXTENSIVE MOTION IN LIMINE PRACTICE HERE AS WELL THAT WILL OCCUPY SOME 12:40PM 8 12:40PM 9 TIME. 12:40PM 10 SO HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD NEED OR YOU WOULD LIKE, MR. LEACH, MR. WADE, TO MEET AND CONFER? 12:40PM 11 12:40PM 12 SHOULD I LEAVE THE AUGUST 31ST CONFERENCE DATE, STATUS 12:40PM 13 DATE NOW AND USE THAT? OR SHOULD WE COME BACK BEFORE THEN? MR. LEACH: YOUR HONOR, I THINK IT WOULD BE PRUDENT 12:41PM 14 12:41PM 15 TO COME BACK BEFORE THEN JUST SO WE CAN REACH RESOLUTION ON THESE ISSUES. 12:41PM 16 12:41PM 17 THE COURT: SURE. 12:41PM 18 MR. LEACH: AND WE'LL -- SO I THINK A DATE IN EARLY 12:41PM 19 AUGUST IS APPROPRIATE. 12:41PM 20 THE COURT: OKAY. MR. WADE, YOU'RE OKAY WITH THAT? 12:41PM 21 MR. WADE: I BELIEVE I AM, YOUR HONOR. MAYBE THE --12:41PM 22 THE COURT: LET ME -- LET'S TURN TO MS. KRATZMANN, 12:41PM 23 THE KEEPER OF ALL THINGS, AND ASK HER WHAT LOOKS GOOD FOR US. 12:41PM 24 MR. WADE: I'M USED TO SEEING THAT BIG CALENDAR UP 12:41PM 25 ON THE WALL, YOUR HONOR. IT'S VERY DISORIENTING NOT TO HAVE

12:41PM	1	IT.
12:41PM	2	THE COURT: IT IS. IMAGINE HOW I FEEL? I'M SITTING
12:41PM	3	HERE ALONE WITH A LAPTOP, A PENCIL, AND A PAD, AND THERE IS NO
12:41PM	4	CALENDAR, AND THERE'S NOBODY TO TURN TO.
12:41PM	5	(LAUGHTER.)
12:41PM	6	THE CLERK: YOUR HONOR, MIGHT I SUGGEST AUGUST 10TH
12:41PM	7	AT 10:00 A.M.
12:42PM	8	THE COURT: IS THAT A MONDAY?
12:42PM	9	THE CLERK: THAT IS A MONDAY, YOUR HONOR.
12:42PM	10	THE COURT: IT IS A MONDAY.
12:42PM	11	DOES THAT WORK FOR THE PARTIES?
12:42PM	12	MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, I HAPPEN TO HAVE A CONFLICT
12:42PM	13	ON THAT DATE. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT WE CAN DO EITHER THE 3RD OR
12:42PM	14	THE 17TH?
12:42PM	15	THE COURT: LET'S SEE. MS. KRATZMANN, WE CAN DO A
12:42PM	16	DATE OTHER THAN A MONDAY IF NEED BE. WE CAN SPECIAL SET THIS.
12:42PM	17	THE CLERK: WE COULD, YOUR HONOR.
12:42PM	18	IS THE WEEK OF THE 10TH NOT AVAILABLE FOR COUNSEL? WE
12:42PM	19	COULD DO AUGUST 11TH OR 12TH.
12:42PM	20	MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, MIGHT I ASK IF WE MIGHT JUST
12:42PM	21	CONFER WITH COLLEAGUES AND CIRCLE BACK WITH MS. KRATZMANN
12:42PM	22	THE COURT: YES.
12:42PM	23	MR. WADE: TO MAKE SURE WE FIND A DATE? IT'S A
12:42PM	24	LITTLE HARD TO DO. NORMALLY WE WOULD BE WHISPERING IN EACH
12:42PM	25	OTHER'S EARS RIGHT NOW, AND IT'S A LITTLE DIFFICULT TO DO THAT.

1 12:43PM 12:43PM 2 3 12:43PM 12:43PM 4 12:43PM 12:43PM 6 12:43PM 7 12:43PM 8 12:43PM 9 12:43PM 10 12:43PM 11 12:43PM 12 12:43PM 13 12:43PM 14 12:43PM 15 12:43PM 16 12:43PM 17 12:43PM 18 12:43PM 19 12:44PM 20 12:44PM 21 12:44PM 22 12:44PM 23 12:44PM 24 12:44PM 25

SO MAYBE WE CAN DO THAT AND CONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND COME UP WITH A DATE IN THAT WINDOW.

THE COURT: RIGHT. WELL, LET ME DO THIS. THEN I WON'T DISTURB THE TRIAL DATE NOW JUST FOR PURPOSES OF OBSERVING THE TRIAL EXCLUSION.

I AM GOING TO -- YOU UNDERSTAND, MR. LEACH, YOU'RE

RELIEVED FROM -- THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE ANY WITNESSES THAT

DATE, AND YOU DON'T NEED TO GO FORWARD WITH ANY OF THAT WORK

THAT YOU TOLD ME ABOUT.

MR. LEACH: UNDERSTOOD, YOUR HONOR. JUST SO I'M

CLEAR, I BLAME MYSELF FOR THAT, NOT THE COURT, WHEN I'M DEALING

WITH WITNESSES. SO PLEASE DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT.

THE COURT: OKAY.

BUT WHAT I WILL DO IS HAVE YOU MEET AND CONFER AND GET
BACK TO MS. KRATZMANN AS TO A DATE THAT YOU THINK IS
APPROPRIATE FOR OUR FURTHER STATUS CONFERENCE IN RE TRIAL DATE.
AND WHAT I'D LIKE YOU TO DO IS TO TALK ABOUT, TO THE EXTENT
THAT YOU CAN, THE ADDITIONAL MOTION PRACTICE THAT NEEDS TO BE
DONE, ANY OTHER MOTIONS AND ANY OTHER -- ANYTHING THAT YOU
THINK WOULD CONSUME SOME TIME SUCH THAT WE CAN SET, SO THE
COURT CAN SET A REALISTIC TRIAL DATE AT LEAST ON OUR END FOR
NEXT YEAR, AND WE'LL SET THAT DATE. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE ON A
MONDAY.

MS. KRATZMANN CAN TALK WITH YOU ABOUT SPECIAL SETTING SOMETHING, AND IT WILL BE A ZOOM HEARING AGAIN FOR THAT

1 PURPOSE. 12:44PM AND THEN WE'LL LEAVE MR. BALWANI'S AUGUST 31ST DATE 12:44PM 2 UNDISTURBED, WE'LL LEAVE THAT STATUS DATE UNDISTURBED NOW AND 3 12:44PM 12:44PM 4 ANY TIME EXCLUSIONS WE'LL CONTINUE TO THAT DATE. ANY OBJECTION TO THAT, MR. COOPERSMITH? 12:44PM 5 MR. COOPERSMITH: YOUR HONOR, NO OBJECTION TO AN 12:44PM 6 12:44PM 7 AUGUST 31ST STATUS CONFERENCE THAT IS ALREADY ON CALENDAR. THE ONE THING I WOULD LIKE TO CLARIFY WITH YOUR HONOR IS 12:44PM 8 ON THE MEET AND CONFER THAT YOUR HONOR HAS DIRECTED REGARDING 12:44PM 9 12:45PM 10 THE TRIAL DATE FOR MS. HOLMES'S TRIAL AND THE MOTIONS PRACTICE, 12:45PM 11 DOES THE COURT ENVISION THAT WE WOULD BE A PART OF THAT? WE 12:45PM 12 CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO BE BECAUSE, ONE, THE TRIAL DATE FOR MS. HOLMES OBVIOUSLY DIRECTLY AFFECTS US AND IT'S DISCONCERTING 12:45PM 13 TO JUST BE PRESENTED WITH SOMETHING AS A FAIT ACCOMPLI WITHOUT 12:45PM 14 12:45PM 15 HAVING HAD ANY INPUT. AND THEN SECOND, ON SOME, ALTHOUGH PERHAPS NOT ALL, OF THE 12:45PM 16 12:45PM 17 MOTIONS WE FEEL LIKE WHATEVER RULING IS MADE FROM AN 12:45PM 18 EVIDENTIARY STANDPOINT AND SO FORTH DOES HAVE AN IMPACT ON US 12:45PM 19 AS WELL FOR THE SECOND TRIAL. 12:45PM 20 SO WE WOULD LIKE TO BE, AND I'M HOPING THE COURT ENVISIONS WE WOULD BE PART OF THAT MEET AND CONFER PROCESS EVEN THOUGH 12:45PM 21 12:45PM 22 OUR STATUS CONFERENCE REMAINS ON AUGUST 31ST. 12:45PM 23 THE COURT: MR. LEACH? 12:45PM 24 MR. LEACH: I HAVE NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. 12:45PM 25 THE COURT: OKAY. SO I KNOW YOU'VE ALL SEEN THE

1 12:45PM 2 12:45PM 3 12:45PM 12:46PM 4 12:46PM 12:46PM 6 12:46PM 7 12:46PM 8 12:46PM 9 12:46PM 10 12:46PM 11 12:46PM 12 12:46PM 13 12:46PM 14 12:46PM 15 12:46PM 16 12:46PM 17 12:46PM 18 12:46PM 19 12:46PM 20 12:46PM 21 12:46PM 22 12:47PM 23 12:47PM 24

12:47PM 25

PLAY "HAMILTON," MR. COOPERSMITH. SO IT APPEARS THAT MR. LEACH IS GOING TO ALLOW YOU IN THE ROOM I THINK IS THE SONG.

ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN BE PART OF THAT, AND TO THE EXTENT

THAT YOU CAN HAVE SOME ASSISTANCE FOR EFFICIENCY OF DATES, THAT

WOULD BE HELPFUL. THANK YOU.

BUT YOUR STATUS DATE, MR. COOPERSMITH, INCLUDING ANY TIME EXCLUSION, AND YOU HAVE NO OBJECTION TO EXCLUDING TIME FOR YOUR CLIENT TO ALLOW YOU TO EFFECTIVELY -- CONTINUE TO EFFECTIVELY PREPARE.

MR. COOPERSMITH: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. WE'LL NOTE THAT TIME EXCLUSION.

AND THEN I'LL WAIT TO HEAR FROM YOU, MS. KRATZMANN WILL HEAR FROM YOU, AND THEN WE'LL SCHEDULE THE NEXT STATUS

CONFERENCE ACCORDINGLY.

AS TO THE MOTIONS THEMSELVES THAT ARE ON THE TABLE TODAY,
I ALSO WANT YOU, IN YOUR MEET AND CONFER, I THINK IT WOULD BE
HELPFUL -- I'M GOING TO TAKE THEM UNDER SUBMISSION, BUT I THINK
IT WOULD BE HELPFUL ALSO AND WHEN WE NEXT GET TOGETHER FOR YOU
TO TELL ME NOT JUST THE DATES AND THE WORK THAT YOU THINK NEEDS
TO BE DONE, BUT ALSO THE EFFECT OF THOSE MOTIONS AND ANY OTHER
ADDITIONAL MOTION PRACTICE THAT YOU THINK MIGHT HAVE BEARING ON
THE COURT'S RULINGS ON THESE MOTIONS AND WHY OR HOW THE COURT
SHOULD RULE ON THESE PARTICULAR MOTIONS.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT QUESTION, MR. WADE?

12:47PM	1	MR. WADE: I DO, YOUR HONOR.
12:47PM	2	THE COURT: MR. LEACH?
12:47PM	3	MR. LEACH: I DO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU,
12:47PM	4	YOUR HONOR.
12:47PM	5	THE COURT: I THINK I'VE GIVEN YOU SOME HINTS ABOUT
12:47PM	6	AT LEAST SOME OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THIS REALLY IS RELATED
12:47PM	7	TO THE GOVERNMENT'S INFORMATION REGARDING THE GOVERNMENT'S
12:47PM	8	EXPERTS AND THINGS.
12:47PM	9	AS I SAID, I EXPECT THAT I'LL AND THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD
12:47PM	10	EXPECT THAT THE COURT WOULD WANT SOME ADDITIONAL FOUNDATIONAL
12:47PM	11	AS TO SOME OF THESE WITNESSES IF THEY MOVE FROM WHAT IS IT?
12:47PM	12	PERCIPIENT OBSERVATION TO MORE OF THE 702 TYPE THAT WE'VE
12:47PM	13	TALKED ABOUT, AND I THINK IT RELATES TO THOSE SIX WITNESSES
12:47PM	14	THAT WE TALKED ABOUT EARLIER, THE DOCTORS AND THE OTHERS.
12:47PM	15	OKAY. ANYTHING FURTHER BEFORE WE CONCLUDE TODAY'S HEARING
12:47PM	16	OTHER THAN ME WISHING YOU WELL AND THAT YOU AND YOUR FAMILIES
12:48PM	17	REMAIN SAFE. IT'S ALWAYS A PLEASURE TO SEE ALL OF YOU. I
12:48PM	18	APPRECIATE THAT.
12:48PM	19	ANYTHING FURTHER?
12:48PM	20	MR. LEACH: NOT FROM THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR.
12:48PM	21	THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE TIME AND THE COURT'S COMMENTS.
12:48PM	22	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
12:48PM	23	MR. WADE?
12:48PM	24	MR. WADE: NOTHING FURTHER FROM MS. HOLMES,
12:48PM	25	YOUR HONOR. WE, TOO, WE WISH THE SAME TO THE COURT, AND WE

12:48PM	1	APPRECIATE THE COURT'S COMMENTS, AND I HOPE EVERYONE CONTINUES
12:48PM	2	TO BE SAFE, YOU AND ALL OF YOUR STAFF.
12:48PM	3	THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
12:48PM	4	MR. COOPERSMITH: NOTHING FURTHER FROM MR. BALWANI.
12:48PM	5	AND, OF COURSE, WE ECHO THOSE COMMENTS AS WELL. THANK YOU.
12:48PM	6	THE COURT: THANK YOU. WE'LL SEE YOU SOON. WE'LL
12:48PM	7	END THIS ZOOM CONFERENCE NOW.
12:48PM	8	THANK YOU, MS. KRATZMANN.
12:48PM	9	THE CLERK: COURT IS ADJOURNED.
12:48PM	10	(COURT CONCLUDED AT 12:48 P.M.)
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074 DATED: JULY 21, 2020 

## EXHIBIT G

From: Jack Lord
To: Donald Lucas

**Sent:** 9/22/2013 6:24:06 PM

Subject: Re: Checking in

I am just boarding a flight to Dallas - land 630 eastern

```
Sent from my iPhone
```

```
> On Sep 22, 2013, at 2:18 PM, Donald Lucas <
> Yes done. What time zone are you in. Just landed at JFK
> Don Lucas
> Lucas Venture Group
> 545 Middlefield Road: USA
> O: (650)
> C: (650) 3
>
>
>> On Sep 22, 2013, at 2:16 PM, "Jack Lord" <
                                                                  wrote:
>> Thanks Don - what are best times and number for a call?
>> Also please pass on note about K-1 to someone in your office
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>>> On Sep 22, 2013, at 2:12 PM, Donald Lucas <
                                                                    wrote:
```

>>> All good Jon. I am investing \$20 million into a company you should be interested in. Eric Topol has tweeted a lot about it. Theranos. It is a deal my dad was Chairman of until his Alzheimer's. I was given the opportunity by Eluzabeth, the founder and CEO as a continuation of his legacy. She also asked me to work with her as an advisor to the company. They do not need any money they have been cash flow positive since 2006. World changer. Revolutionary. I am buying stock at a price set in 2011 which was \$6 billion. Trust me, you probably just spit up your vodka, it is a deal.

wrote:

>>> Just arriving in NYC for meeting with ceo of JDRF and global head of research. Short fuse here. Have to close by September 30th.

>>> Very confidential. My dads group/ side of the family does not know that I am involved.

```
>>> Www.theranos.com.
```

>>> Or lucasventuregroup. Com

>>>

>>> Call me if you are serious can tell more.

>>> Best regards

>>> Don

>>>

>>> Don Lucas

>>> Lucas Venture Group

>>> 545 Middlefield Road: USA

>>> O: (650)

>>> C: (650)

>>> >>>

>>>

>>> On Sep 22, 2013, at 7:35 AM, "Jonathan Lord"

>>>> Hope all is well Don - keep up with the family through Facebook >>>> What's new on your end?

>>>> Also - we are hunting down the K-1's for this year so we can close out taxes - please advise

>>>> Cheers

>>>> J